

HANDBOUND
AT THE



UNIVERSITY OF
TORONTO PRESS



Digitized by the Internet Archive
in 2008 with funding from
Microsoft Corporation

THE
CLASSICAL
REVIEW

EDITED BY W. H. D. ROUSE
AND A. D. GODLEY

BOARD OF MANAGEMENT:

PROF. R. S. CONWAY, Litt.D. (*Chairman*)

W. E. P. PANTIN, M.A. (*Hon. Treasurer*)

E. HARRISON, M.A. (*Hon. Secretary*)

PROF. GILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D.Litt., F.B.A., F.R.S.L.; R. C. SEATON, M.A.;

H. RICHARDS, M.A.; PROF. W. RIDGEWAY, D.Litt., Litt.D., Sc.D., LL.D., F.B.A.

With the co-operation of—PROF. W. GARDNER HALE, University of Chicago; PRINCIPAL
W. PETERSON, LL.D., C.M.G., McGill University, Montreal; PROF. T. G. TUCKER,
Litt.D., University of Melbourne; PROF. JOHN WILLIAMS WHITE, LL.D., Litt.D.,
Harvard University.

VOLUME XXVIII.

PUBLISHED FOR THE CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION

LONDON

JOHN MURRAY, ALBEMARLE STREET, W.

BOSTON, MASS.

GINN AND COMPANY, 29, BEACON STREET

1914

14/6 5-8
12/2/17.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

No. 1.

Original Contributions :	PAGE	Short Notices—continued :	PAGE
On the Meaning of λόγος in Certain Passages in Aristotle's <i>Nicomachean Ethics</i> . A. R. LORD . . .	1	Pater's <i>Marius the Epicurean</i> . W. H. D. R.	24
On the Meaning of λόγος in Aristotle's <i>Ethics</i> . JOHN BURNET . . .	6	Jones, <i>A Catalogue of the Sculptures of the Museo Capitolino</i> . E. M. W. T.	24
In <i>Propertium Retractationes Selectae</i> . J. S. PHILLIMORE . . .	7	Taylor, <i>The Cults of Ostia</i> . H. STUART JONES	25
Reviews :		Platner, <i>The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome</i> . H. STUART JONES	26
Hude's <i>Lysias</i> . J. E. SANDYS . . .	12	Bouchier's <i>Life and Letters in Roman Africa</i> . J. S. R.	26
Mooney. <i>The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius</i> . R. C. SEATON . . .	15	Bury, <i>The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century, with a Revised Text of the Kletorologion of Philotheos</i> . G.	27
Kramer's <i>Valerius Flaccus</i> . WALTER C. SUMMERS	19	Maurice's <i>Numismatique Constantienne</i> . G. F. H.	28
Short Notices :		Lagercrantz's <i>Papyrus Graecus Holmiensis, Recepte für Silber, Steine und Purpur</i> . A. S. H. . . .	28
Smith's <i>Greek Art and National Life</i> . R. B. APPLETON	21	Manatt's <i>Aegean Days</i> . W. H. D. ROUSE	28
Heath's <i>Aristarchus of Samos</i> . J. GOW	22	Correspondence	29
Meillet's <i>Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque</i> . R. L. TURNER . . .	23	Version	30
<i>Dikaiomata: Auszüge aus Alexandrinischen Gesetzen und Verordnungen in einem Papyrus des philologischen Seminars der Universität Halle, von der Graeca Halensis</i> . A. S. H.	23	Obituary	30
Lesquier's <i>Papyrus de Magdola</i> . A. S. H.	24	Books Received	31

No. 2.

Original Contributions :		Original Contributions—continued :	
Aristotle, <i>Prior Analytics</i> , II. 23. G. E. UNDERHILL	33	Notes on the <i>Commonitorium</i> of Orientius. F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK	41
The Meaning of the Word τελετή. J. E. HARRISON	36	Notes on the <i>Agricola</i> . F. HAVERFIELD	43
The Source of Plutarch : <i>Solon XX.-XXIV</i> . F. E. ADCOCK	38	F. H. on <i>Portus Itius</i> . T. RICE HOLMES	45
' <i>Alcumenae</i> Euripidi.' E. A. SONNENSCHN	40		

Notes :	PAGE	Short Notices—continued :	PAGE
Emendation of Euripides, <i>Bacchae</i> , 677-678. J. E. HARRY . . .	47	Swindler's <i>Cretan Elements in the Cults and Ritual of Apollo</i> . J. E. HARRISON . . .	62
Euripides, <i>Bacchae</i> , 659. J. U. POWELL . . .	48	Bevan's <i>Stoics and Sceptics</i> . E. VER- NON ARNOLD . . .	62
A Note on the Word <i>κρήδεμνον</i> . F. A. WRIGHT . . .	49	Plasberg's <i>Paradoxa, Academica, Timaeus, De Natura Deorum, De Divinatione, De Fato</i> . ALBERT C. CLARK . . .	63
Demosthenes' <i>Leptines</i> . R. J. SHACKLE . . .	49	Waltzing's <i>Felicitis Octavius</i> . A. C. CLARK . . .	64
Reviews :		Hieronymi <i>Epistolæ (Corpus Scrip- torum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum)</i> . LV. E. W. WATSON . . .	65
Some Mathematical Books. T. L. HEATH . . .	50	Hieronymi in Hieremian (<i>Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum La- tinorum</i>). LIX. E. W. WAT- SON . . .	65
Keller's <i>Die Antike Tierwelt</i> . J. E. SANDYS . . .	53	Karsten's <i>Terentian Scholia</i> . C. H. KEENE . . .	66
Leonhard's <i>Hettiler und Amazonen</i> ; Bennett's <i>Religious Cults associated with the Amazons</i> . X. . .	57	Giarratano's <i>De Re Coquinaria</i> . S. GASELEE . . .	66
Riepl's <i>Ancient Method's of Com- munication</i> . J. S. REID . . .	58	Brinkgreve's <i>Statii Achilleis</i> . H. W. GARROD . . .	67
Short Notices :		Correspondence . . .	67
Ehrlich's <i>Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung</i> . R. L. TURNER . . .	60	Notes and News. . .	69
Brugmann's <i>Griechische Grammatik, Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre, Syntax</i> . R. L. TURNER . . .	60	Books Received. . .	71
Strong's <i>Syrian Goddess</i> . J. E. HAR- RISON . . .	61		

No. 3.

Original Contributions :

The New Lyric Fragments. J. M. EDMONDS . . .	73
In Propertium <i>Retractationes Se- lectae</i> . J. S. PHILLIMORE . . .	79
Portus Itius. F. H. . . .	82

Notes :

On Thucydides II. 48. 3. J. P. POSTGATE . . .	84
Notes on Two Suspected Passages in the <i>Phaedo</i> . MARGARET E. J. TAYLOR . . .	85
Note on Pindar. W. T. LENDRUM . . .	86
Note on Eur. <i>Rhesus</i> , 287 ff. J. T. SHEPPARD . . .	87
On a New Fragment of Callimachus' <i>Æria</i> . J. U. POWELL . . .	88

Notes—continued :

Note on <i>Aeneid</i> VII. 748-9. W. WARDE FOWLER . . .	88
On the <i>Mensae</i> of <i>Aeneid</i> , III. 257, and VII. 116. J. W. M. . . .	89

Reviews :

Pöhlmann, <i>The History of the Social Question in the Antique World</i> . FRANK GRANGER . . .	90
Zimmern, <i>The Greek Commonwealth</i> . T. NICKLIN . . .	93
Gaetano de Sanctis, <i>Αθήναι</i> . J. R. BROWN . . .	96
Way's Translations: <i>Theocritus</i> and <i>Quintus Smyrnaeus</i> . A. S. OWEN . . .	97
Some School Books: Humphreys' <i>Demosthenes, On the Crown</i> ;	

Reviews—continued :

PAGE

- Rehdanz and Carnuth's *Xenophon, Anabasis. Nicklin's Greek Vocabulary for the Use of Schools.* Owen's *Brief History of Greece and Rome.* G. W. and L. S. Botsford's *Source Book of Ancient History.* Σ. 98
 Litchfield, *Cicero's Judgment on Lucretius*; Reid's *Lucretiana.* CYRIL BAILEY 100
 Teuffel's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*; Schanz's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur.* H. W. GARROD 103

Short Notices :

- Baur's *Centauris in Ancient Art : the Archaic Period.* P. GARDNER . 104
 Majer-Leonhard's *Ἀγράμματα.* W. H. D. R. 105

Short Notices—continued :

PAGE

- Cagnat's *L'armée romaine d'Afrique et l'occupation militaire de l'Afrique sous les empereurs.* G. L. C. . 105
 Neher's *Anonymus de Rebus Bellicis.* C. O. 106
 Bloch's *La République Romaine. Les conflits politiques et sociaux.* J. G. C. ANDERSON 107
 Cagnat's *Cours d'épigraphie latine.* F. H. 107
 Magoffin, *The Quinquennales.* E. G. HARDY 108
 Thulin's *Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum.* W. WARDE FOWLER 108

- Notes and News 109
 Version 111
 Books Received 111

No. 4.

Original Contributions :

- The Aristotelian Enthymeme. R. C. SEATON 113
 Note on *Culex*, Lines 24-41. W. WARDE FOWLER AND R. S. C. . 119
 Note on Polybius III. 47-50, and Livy XXI. 31, 32. SPENSER WILKINSON 123
 The New Lyric Fragments. A. S. HUNT 126

Note :

- Demosthenes, *Leptines*, § 139. J. E. SANDYS 128

Reviews :

- (1) Van Leeuwen's *Homeri Carmina*; (2) Finsler's *Homer*; (3) Roemer's *Homerische Aufsätze*; (4) *Die Odyssee als Dichtung und ihr Verhältnis zur Ilias.* A. SHEWAN 128
 Preisendanz's *Carmina Anacreontea e Bybl. Nat. Par. Cod. Gr. Suppl.* 384. J. M. EDMONDS . . . 132
 Hall's *Companion to Classical Texts.* HERBERT RICHARDS . . . 133
 Kukula's *C. Plini Caecili Secundi*

Reviews—continued :

- Epistularum Libri Novem Epistularum Ad Traianum Liber Panegyricus.* J. WIGHT DUFF . . 134
 Stuttaford's *Poems of Gaius Valerius Catullus*; Cornish, Postgate, and Mackail's *Catullus, Tibullus, and the Pervigilium Veneris*; Davis' *Translations from Catullus.* J. F. ROXBURGH 137
 Durel : (1) *Les Instructions de Commodien Traduction et Commentaire*; (2) *Commodien : Recherches sur la Doctrine, la langue et le vocabulaire du poète.* J. S. P. . 139

Short Notices :

- Roemer's *Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homerkritik (wirkliche und angebliche).* T. W. ALLEN . . 141
 Pickard-Cambridge, *The Public Orations of Demosthenes.* E. HARRISON 142

Correspondence :

- Cicero and Lucretius 142
 Notes and News 143
 Books Received 143

No. 5.

Original Contributions :

PAGE

- The Persian Expedition to Delphi.
S. CASSON 145
- Prose Rhythm in Welsh and English : with Special Reference to the Latin *Cursus*. W. RHYS ROBERTS 151

Notes :

- Pindar, *Nem.* III. 3. : A Reply.
W. M. L. HUTCHINSON 156
- Ἡσέε as Evidence for *Éssé*. CARL D. BUCK 157
- Note on Statius, *Silvae*, I. vi. 75-80.
G. M. HIRST 158

Reviews :

- Edmonds, *The Greek Bucolic Poets*.
ALBERT C. CLARK 159
- Perrot and Chipiez, *Histoire l'Art dans l'Antiquité*. P. GARDNER . 163
- The Princeton Expeditions to Syria. W. H. D. ROUSE . . . 165
- Weller's *Athens and its Monuments*.
E. A. GARDNER 166
- Cardinali's *Studi Graccani*. M. O. B. CASPARI 167
- Fischer's *Quaestiones Aeneanae*.
L. W. HUNTER 169
- Reid, *The Municipalities of the Roman Empire*. F. HAVERFIELD 171
- Holmes' *Caesar de Bello Gallico*.
W. W. HOW 172

Reviews—continued :

PAGE

- Sargeant's *Terence*. C. H. KEENE 174
- Butler's *Propertius*. H. W. GARROD 175
- Hardy's *Roman Laws and Charters*.
J. S. BLAKE REED 176

Short Notices :

- Adam's *Plato : Moral and Political Ideals*. R. G. B. 177
- Wissowa and Kroll, *Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. G. F. H. . 177
- Gronau's *Poseidonius und die jüdisch-christliche Genesisexegese*. W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE 178
- Neugebauer's *Tafeln für Sonne, Planeten und Mond nebst Tafeln der Mondphasen*. A. S. EDDINGTON 179
- Weissenborn's *Titi Liui a.n.c. libri*.
C. F. WALTERS 179
- Mommsen's *Gesammelte Schriften*.
F. H. 180
- Helm's *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Metamorphoseon Libri XI*.
S. G. 181
- Apulei Platonici Madaurensis pro se de Magia liber (Apologia)*. H. E. BUTLER 181
- Vollmer's *Poetae Latini Minores*.
J. JACKSON 182
- Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*. R. G. BURY 182
- Books Received 183

No. 6.

Original Contributions :

- Socrates and the *δαμόνιον*. R. E. MACNAGHTEN 185
- On Sappho's Ode. T. L. AGAR . 189
- The Bright Aldebaran. J. E. HARRY 190
- Dr. J. B. Mayor on the Use of *ἐν* and *ἐντρί*, and *αὐτῷ* and *αὐτῶ*, in the New Testament.
J. U. POWELL 191
- Portus Itius. T. RICE HOLMES . 193

Notes :

- Pisidian Stelae. A. H. SAYCE . 196
- Αὐξάνιος. J. P. POSTGATE . . 197

Reviews :

- Various Writers on Graeco-Roman Egypt*. H. I. BELL 198
- Murray's *Rhesus*. A. S. OWEN . 201
- Kalinka's *Commentationes Aenipontanae*. W. E. P. PANTIN . . 203
- Teufer's *Zur Geschichte der Frauene-*

Reviews—continued :

PAGE

<i>manzipation im allen Rom.</i> FRANK GRANGER	204
<i>New Teubner Text of the "De Senec-tute."</i> ALBERT C. CLARK	205
<i>Leo's History of Latin Literature.</i> E. A. SONNENSCHN	206
<i>Loew's Beneventan Script : a History of the South Italian Minuscule.</i> W. M. LINDSAY	209
<i>Some School Books.</i> Σ.	210
<i>New Teubner Text of the "Annals."</i> C. D. FISHER	212

Short Notices :

PAGE

<i>English Literature and the Classics.</i> R. B. APPLETON	213
<i>Westaway's Quantity and Accent in the Pronunciation of Latin.</i> E. A. SONNENSCHN	213
<i>Blum's De compositione numerosa dialogi Ciceronis de Amicitia.</i> ALBERT C. CLARK	214
<i>Peterson's Dialogus.</i> Hutton's <i>Agri-cola, Germania.</i> C. D. FISHER	214
<i>Notes and News</i>	215
<i>Books Received.</i>	216

No. 7.

Original Contributions :

<i>Ad Plutarchi De Pythiae Oraculis.</i> J. H. W. STRIJD	217
<i>A Few Notes on the Text of Marcus Aurelius.</i> C. R. HAINES	219
<i>Some Notes on the Homeric Hymns.</i> HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE	221
<i>αἰτναῖοι κἀνθαροί.</i> A. C. PEARSON	223
<i>The Panathenaic Ship of Herodes Atticus.</i> ERNEST A. GARDNER	225
<i>Legions and Auxilia.</i> F. HAVERFIELD	226

Notes :

<i>The Enclitic Forms of ἐγὼ and σὺ, with Special Reference to John xx. 17 and Acts xxvi. 28.</i> H. DARNLEY NAYLOR	227
<i>Note on Plato, Phaedo, p. 105a.</i> E. C. MARCHANT	228
<i>ἄνωρις—ὄνωρις.</i> W. R. PATON	229
<i>Corinna.</i> W. R. PATON	229
<i>A Note on Soph. O. T. 980-2.</i> H. J. ROSE	230

Reviews :

<i>Smyth, The Composition of the Iliad.</i> T. W. ALLEN	230
<i>Hackforth, The Authorship of the Platonic Epistles.</i> R. G. B.	231
<i>Gercke, Die Entstehung der Aeneis.</i> L. W. HUNTER	232
<i>Two Editions of Lucan.</i> W. B. ANDERSON	235

Reviews—continued :

<i>McIntosh, A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis.</i> G. A. COOKE	239
<i>Fowler's Roman Ideas of Deity in the last Century before the Christian Era.</i> CYRIL BAILEY	241
<i>Haverfield's Ancient Town-Planning.</i> J. S. REID	244
<i>Lindsay's Festus.</i> W. WARDE FOWLER	246

Short Notices :

<i>Watson's Vives on Éducation.</i> W. H. D. R.	247
<i>Formigé's Remarques diverses sur les Théâtres Romains.</i> F. H.	248
<i>Holmes, Caesaris et Hirti commentarii de bello Gallico.</i> W. W. How	249
<i>Gardner's Principles of Greek Art.</i> E. M. W. T.	249
<i>Burnet, Die Anfänge der griechischen Philosophie.</i> A. C. PEARSON	250
<i>Baumgarten, Poland, and Wagner, Die Hellenistisch-roemische Kultur.</i> W. S. FERGUSON	250
<i>Veröffentlichungen aus der Papyrus-Sammlung.</i> A. S. H.	250
<i>Fischer's Thucydidis Reliquiae in Papyris et Membranis Aegyptiacis Servatae.</i> W. R. M. LAMB	251
<i>Ballou, De clausulis a Flavio Vopisco Syracusio adhibitilis.</i> ALBERT C. CLARK	251

Short Notices—continued :

PAGE

Jones' <i>Companion to Roman History</i> .	
W. H. D. R.	252
Ernout's <i>Latin Morphology</i> . W. M.	
LINDSAY	253
Heseltine's <i>Petronius</i> . H. W. GAR-	
ROD	253
Vrba, Zycha, and Petschenig, <i>Cor-</i>	

Short Notices—continued :

PAGE

<i>pus Scriptorum</i> . E. W. WAT-	
SON	254
Riese, <i>Das rheinische Germanien</i> .	
G. L. CHEESMAN	255
Correspondence	256
Books Received	256

No. 8.

Original Contributions :

Plutarch, <i>Moralia</i> . H. RICHARDS .	257
'Fairy Gold': An Ancient Belief.	
H. J. ROSE	262
Aquai in Lucretius. H. W. GARROD	264

Notes :

On the Derivation of the Word	
πόλεμος. W. F. WITTON	266
ἀσπίς σείριος in Eur. I. A. 6-7.	
A. E. HOUSMAN	267
On Two Passages in Demosthenes'	
<i>For Phormio</i> . W. RENNIE	267
Calpurnius and Valerius Flaccus.	
R. J. SHACKLE	268
Dryden and Statius. WALTER C.	
SUMMERS	268

Reviews :

Thompson, <i>A New Decipherment of</i>	
<i>the Hittite Hieroglyphs</i> . H. R.	
HALL	269
Mutschmann's <i>Sexti Empirici Opera</i> ;	
Pasquali's <i>Procli Diadochi in</i>	
<i>Platonis Cratylum Commentaria</i> ;	
Ritzenfeld's <i>Procli Diadochi Lycii</i>	
<i>Institutio Physica</i> ; Weis-Leibers-	
<i>dorf's Diadochus De Perfectione</i>	
<i>Spiritali</i> . R. G. B.	270
Garrod's <i>Manili Astronomicum</i> ,	
Liber II. T. NICKLIN	271
Rosenberg, <i>The City State in Ancient</i>	
<i>Italy (Der Staat der alten Italiker)</i> .	
R. S. CONWAY	274
Frank's <i>Roman Imperialism</i> . L. E.	
MATTHAEI	276
School Books. Σ.	277

Short Notices :

<i>Exempla Codicum Graecorum</i> . W. K.	
LOWTHER CLARKE	279

Short Notices—continued :

Butler, <i>Some Leisure Hours of a</i>	
<i>Long Life</i> . A. D. G.	279
Woodward and Mattingly, <i>St. John</i>	
<i>Damascene, Barlaam and Joasaph</i> .	
W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE	280
Laurand, <i>A propos d'Homère : Pro-</i>	
<i>grès et Recul de la Critique</i> .	
W. E. P. PANTIN	281
Apelt's <i>Platonische Aufsätze</i> . MARIE	
V. WILLIAMS	281
Entz's <i>Pessimismus und Weltflucht</i>	
<i>bei Platon</i> . MARIE V. WILLIAMS	282
Herbig's <i>Tituli Faleriorum Veterum</i>	
<i>Linguis Falisca et Etrusca Con-</i>	
<i>scripti</i> . R. S. C.	282
Thomas's <i>Studien zur Lateinischen</i>	
<i>und Griechischen Sprachgeschichte</i> .	
R. S. C.	283
Latin Comedy. W. E. P. PANTIN	283
Fessler's <i>Benutzung der philosophi-</i>	
<i>schen Schriften Ciceros durch Lac-</i>	
<i>lanz</i> . ALBERT C. CLARK	284
Hubbell, <i>The Influence of Isocrates</i>	
<i>on Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides</i> .	
R. B. APPLETON	285
<i>Bibliotheca Philologica Classica et</i>	
<i>Archaeologica</i> ; Masqueray, <i>Bib-</i>	
<i>liographie Pratique de la Littéra-</i>	
<i>ture Grecque des origines à la fin</i>	
<i>de la période Romaine</i> . R. B.	
APPLETON	285
Rogers, <i>The Peace of Aristophanes</i> .	
H. RICHARDS	286
Translation	286
Notes and News	287
Correspondence	287
Books Received	288

The Classical Review

FEBRUARY, 1914

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

ON THE MEANING OF ΛΟΓΟΣ IN CERTAIN PASSAGES IN ARISTOTLE'S *NICOMACHEAN ETHICS*.

PROFESSOR COOK WILSON'S article under the above title in the June number of the *Classical Review* is likely to arouse both the interest and the hostility of many students of Aristotle. Many will find his great reputation and the imposing array of references sufficient warrant for translating λόγος by 'Reason' for the rest of their lives. But it may be permitted to one who is still 'living in sin' to explain why he (and possibly others) cannot accept Professor Wilson's proffered means of grace. At the same time it is only fitting to record an obligation to Professor Wilson which far outruns the point at which agreement with his view ends.

The position which I wish to defend in this article is not the direct contrary of the former thesis; but rather I wish to show that in none of the passages alleged in support of Professor Wilson's view is it impossible to avoid translating λόγος by 'Reason,' or its derivatives, without some sacrifice of the meaning of the passage. I shall also point out that in some of the passages it is impossible to adopt the version 'reason' without missing a real point in the interpretation. At the same time I must plead guilty to a prejudice (if prejudice it be) which in my mind connects the term 'Reason' with the sixteenth to eighteenth centuries in the modern world and with the Post-

Aristotelians, especially the Stoics, in the ancient. I shall add to the examination of the passages some general observations on λόγος in Aristotle.

I begin with those passages in which Professor Wilson insists that we must translate λόγος by Reason.

Nic. Eth. II. ii. 2, 1103b 31, is a well-known difficulty. Mr. Bywater suspected it, and Professor Burnet brackets the last seventeen words, on the ground that it implies that ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος is a virtue. Is it not possible to avoid this implication? Homer speaks of Nausicaa and her 'other' serving maids, of Athena apart from the 'other' suitors; Xenophon says there was no grass nor any 'other' tree; and Plato says that Socrates has been careless of business, family affairs, military offices, public speaking and 'other' magistracies. It is true that in this use ἄλλος usually has no article; but is that an insuperable difficulty? I should translate, or rather paraphrase, the passage as follows: 'First, then, that action should be in accordance with the right rule is common ground for us and the Platonists alike, and we shall take it for granted—we shall deal with the right rule hereafter, both with its real nature and with its relations to the virtues besides.' I do not see that the admitted difficulty of this passage is helped at all by writing 'right reason' for 'the right rule.' Reason is not a

virtue any more than the right rule is; at least it is quite possible to translate the passages in the sixth book without coming to that conclusion. Before leaving this passage, I might observe that all the Platonic passages, which I have been able to discover, in which the phrase *ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος* is employed, are capable of interpretation on the same lines. Cf. *Polit.* 310. C, *Phaed.* 93. E, *Laws* II. 659. D; also a similar passage in *Soph.* 239.

Nic. Eth. VI. i. 1-3. Here again I am unable to regard it as demonstrably certain that *ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος* is explicitly identified with one of the intellectual virtues. The passage may be paraphrased as follows: 'We have said before that the Mean must be chosen—neither the excess nor the defect; we have also said that the Mean in question is that stated by the right formula; we have therefore to discuss this matter. In every one of the habits of choice we have mentioned—as, indeed, in the others—there is a standard to which the man who knows the formula looks when he regulates his efforts in respect of the extremes, and there is a measure of the Means, which we say are between the excess and the deficiency, constituted in accordance with the right rule or formula. All this is true, but far from clear. Much the same might be said of other practices and pursuits of which there is knowledge to be had. You must not do too much or too little in this direction or in that; you must preserve the mean—in fact, you must follow the right rule. But if you were only told to follow the prescription of the doctor and the formulae of his art, you would still be in ignorance of the proper treatment of the body. So also with the habits of the Soul; it is not enough that our statements were true, we still require to know what the right rule is and what standard it affords.' All this is quite consistent with the view that *ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος* is not a virtue itself, but is the essence, and the formula of the essence, of every *ἡθικὴ ἀρετή*. Nor does it appear that there is any obstacle to taking this line of interpretation so far as the words go.

Nic. Eth. VI. xiii. 4 and 5 is perhaps the crucial passage; for here we have

a phrase which certainly looks like an explicit identification of *ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος* with one of the intellectual virtues, viz. *φρόνησις*. As quoted in Professor Wilson's article the point of the section (which really begins with par. 3) is not readily discerned. Aristotle is here marking the development of the Socratic theory that Virtue is knowledge. The Academy has made a considerable advance on the original view of Socrates; they admit not only that virtue is a habit of choice, but also that the choice is *κατὰ τὸν ὀρθὸν λόγον*, according to the right formula; and further that the right formula is in accordance with Practical Wisdom (*φρόνησις*, which is a virtue). We (the Peripatetics) have little to add to this; we have only to point out that Practical Wisdom exists as the presence of the right rules, or formulae, in the mind of the practically wise man. This is the way in which Professor Burnet takes the passage; and it is confirmed by the places in Plato which the phrase occurs; cf. especially *Politicus* 310C *Πράττουσι μὲν δὴ οὐδ' ἐξ ἑνὸς ὀρθοῦ λόγου*, 'They act from no single correct formula,'—a dialogue which has many affinities with the *Nicomachean Ethics*. In these circumstances there does not seem to be any sufficient reason to adopt the view offered in Professor Wilson's article.

These are the passages on which we are told to rely; it is not necessary to comment on those which they carry with them. In every case it is both possible and reasonable to adopt the same line of interpretation.

Before attempting the solution of the two passages from which Professor Wilson derived his inspiration, let us consider briefly his second line of argument which is based on the quasi-personification of *λόγος* as something which speaks, is listened to, is disregarded, encourages, issues commands, and turns us away from our evil courses. In general there is nothing very violent in the metaphors employed, and nothing to suggest that 'Reason' occupied in Aristotle's mind a place at all analogous to that which it occupied in, e.g. Hooker. Aristotle, for instance, could never have written: 'The rule of

voluntary agents on earth is the sentence that Reason giveth concerning the goodness of those things which they are to do—or if he could, it would not be ‘Reason,’ but ‘the rule’ and ‘the sentence’ that would be expressed by λόγος. Compared with the metaphors of Hooker in the first book of the Laws of Ecclesiastical Polity, the expressions employed by Aristotle are almost literal.

Taking the passages *seriatim*: *Nic. Eth.* VI. i. 1, 1138b 19. ‘The Mean is as the correct formula states it’ can hardly be called a personification of λόγος; the formula is a proposition, and λέγει is the baldest and most natural verb for λόγος. The next passage (VI. ii. 2, 1139a 23) contains a most emphatic point, expressed by the word φάναι. Here Aristotle is drawing attention to the co-operation of judgment and appetite; the latter is a positive pursuit, the former is an affirmative proposition; hence the word φάναι. The point, therefore, is not that the λόγος speaks, but that it says ‘Yes,’ that it is an affirmative proposition. Moreover, in the same passage he says that the λόγος must be true and the appetite correct; so that some rendering meaning ‘proposition’ or ‘judgment,’ perhaps ‘formula,’ would be better than ‘reason’ here.

The passages from VII. and X., in which the λόγος is heard or listened to, are not incompatible with the translation ‘rule.’ In the former (1149a 25)—which comes in a very poetical and metaphorical section—passion hears the λόγος in a sense, but misinterprets what it hears. Greek has apparently two words for such a misinterpretation of an immediate presentation or intuition: παρορᾶν and παρακούειν; of these the latter is obviously the more appropriate here. It is at least as natural to translate ‘rule’ as to write ‘Reason.’ In this passage it is ‘the rule’ that is presented, but is misheard or misinterpreted. In the next (1179b 26), the man who is at the mercy of his environment will not listen to the words of one who would dissuade him. And later in the same section the contrast seems to be between physical compulsion and mere talking; sermons are of no avail,

except where the mind is ready to receive them.

Nic. Eth. I. xiii. 15, 1102b 14, seems to be open to the same line of interpretation. What we approve is the rule which both the morally strong and the morally weak allow—though the former acts with it and the latter against it; we also approve the part of the soul which has the rule or plan—for that is the same in both strong and weak: that part of the soul (NOT the λόγος) encourages them both alike in the right direction; though with different success, for there is another ‘part’ which resists the rule or plan. As Professor Burnet rightly points out the whole passage is Platonic in language as well as in theory. The part of the Soul in question might be called ‘the Reason,’ but it is not the λόγος but that which has the λόγος.

The next group of passages, in which the idea of commanding is present, offers no objection to the interpretation here defended. It would be wearisome to take every passage in detail. There does not appear to be any difficulty, either in Greek or in English, in speaking of a rule ‘prescribing,’ or of ‘setting oneself against’ a rule or plan. Nor do the briefer forms of saying ‘as the rule ordains’ present the smallest difficulty. Ἱατρική also ‘orders’ (κελεύει) in VI. i. 2, 1138b 31; and Ἱατρική is just a set of formulae.

The group of passages referred to on p. 115, at the top of the first column, adds nothing to the argument. The first comes from a sentence which is certainly an interpolation. In addition to Professor Burnet’s arguments, which would be enough to discredit that sentence, I would point out that in the context it is more natural to interpret ‘that which has the plan’ or ‘that which can give an account of itself,’ not as part of the Soul, but an animal. We set aside the life which consists in mere nutrition and growth; next comes the life of sensation; but this belongs as common property to the horse also, and the ox and every animal. There remains the practical life of the animal which can give an account of itself. Some reader has mistaken the phrase for its more familiar meaning, and has interpolated

the sentence with ἐπιπειθές in it. As Professor Burnet has explained, this word alone is enough to make it suspicious. The second passage is more like a personification than any other quoted. At the same time the word *πειθαρχεῖν* is sometimes used for obedience to laws, and in one passage in Comedy for a ship 'obeying' the rudder. The remaining passages are from the last chapter of the first book, a popular exposition of the psychological views of the Academy: and in the course of it there *may* be two places where Aristotle writes λόγος as an elliptical expression for τὸ λόγον ἔχον. In passages like this he is frequently inclined to employ a somewhat more lively and poetical style of expression than he usually does. But even here (the two places are 1102b 17 and 24) it is at least as reasonable to suppose that he means the rule or plan quite strictly, and that the phrases 'fighting and resisting the rule' and 'setting itself against it and withstanding it' are put in expressly for the purpose of showing that *παρὰ τὸν λόγον* is not to be taken to mean 'besides the part which has the plan,' but, literally, are to be taken as 'contrary to the rule.' Indeed, it is quite possible that he never uses λόγος for τὸ λόγον ἔχον.

The passages from the sixth book do not appear to make the rendering 'Reason' inevitable. In some places 'judgment' seems to be the best version: e.g. VI. ii. 4, where the phrase means 'the judgment which states the aim of the act.' It is not, surely, permissible to argue that because that judgment is impossible *without* Mind (or Reason) and understanding, it is therefore identical with Reason.

The passages from the seventh book add nothing to the strength of Professor Wilson's argument; and one of them cannot possibly mean Reason; I refer to VII. iv. 2, 1147b 31. Here the context shows that persons with a special moral weakness are to the generally morally weak as the Olympian victor whose name was Man is to the generalised humanity expressed in the definition of 'man'; in the latter case we have to add to the general formula the words 'who won the boxing-match at Olympia

in 456 B.C.,' and in the former case we have to add to the general formula of moral weakness the words 'in respect of money—or of honour.' It is to be noticed that the persons in question are not moral idiots, but only morally weak, and that in a special direction; it is thus quite to the point to add the words τὸν ἐν αὐτοῖς, and in the context it is difficult to resist the paraphrase: 'those that transgress the right rule of life—which they know quite well—in these respects, we do not describe as morally weak without qualification; but we add . . .' The illustration from the definitory formula of 'man' seems to confirm this interpretation. It is not the Reason that is in them that they transgress, for it is possible to do many unreasonable things without being morally weak; but it is not possible to be ἀκρατής without at once knowing the right rule and acting in the opposite direction.

The examination of these passages—and others like them—does not afford any very strong grounds for supposing that the two texts which are printed at the beginning of Professor Wilson's article should be interpreted on different lines. The first, *Nic. Eth.* II. iii. 5, occurs in a passage containing more than one direct reference to the Academy; cf. the following words and Professor Burnet's note *ad loc.* This is enough to dispose of the objection that the rule has not been stated explicitly yet in the text. The rule was a well-known feature of the doctrine of the Academy; it begins in Plato himself, as we have seen, and was, perhaps, further emphasised by his nephew and successor, to whom the next words certainly refer. In the context the balance of probability seems to be in favour of paraphrasing the passage thus: 'It is the influence of pleasures and pains that produces bad characters—pursuing the wrong pleasures and avoiding the wrong pains, or pursuing and avoiding them at the wrong times, or in the wrong manner, or in any other of the ways of going wrong that are determined by the formula of the rule.'

The second passage is the well-known definition of a goodness of character (*Nic. Eth.* II. vi. 15, 1106b 36), as 'an

acquired habit of choice, the differentia of which is that it is a Mean relatively to the persons concerned; it is determined by the formula or rule of proportion, viz. the rule by which the good citizen would determine it.' By the term 'good citizen' I hope to avoid suggesting the Wise Man of the later schools.

I cannot see that either of these paraphrases would be improved by the importation of the term 'Reason'; the word 'rule,' on the other hand, makes a definite reference to the contemporary theory of the Academy, and the word 'formula' serves to connect the passages with the most technical of Aristotelian uses of the word λόγος. And in the *Ethics* these are the poles of Aristotle's thought. Outwardly, he is in nearly every place speaking to an audience to which the language of Plato and the popularisations of his thought by his successors were quite familiar; that was the basis from which he started to educate men up to the task of ruling. On the other hand, there is running through the treatise an under-current of allusion to his own theory; there are hints to those who know the pure doctrine of the *De Anima* in the last chapter of the first book, while the broad outline there adopted is frankly Academic. It would not be less true than an epigram usually is to say that he composed the work with the Academy in his eye and his own theory at the back of his head. And especially in the case of such a crucial word as λόγος we ought to bear this in mind in our interpretations. It is not a question of the possibility of a single word, nor even a question of taste, but a question of one of the means (and not an unimportant one) of conceiving the relations of the various books in the Aristotelian Corpus in respect of the theory they present.

In this connection it is worth while observing that of all the passages referred to the heading 'cogitandi ac ratiocinandi facultas' in Bonitz's Index one each comes from the *Organon* and the *Rhetoric*; five come from the *De Anima*; seven from the *Metaphysics*; thirteen from the *Politics*; three from the *Magna Moralia*; six from the *Eudemian Ethics*; and forty from the *Ethics*. In not one of the places in the last-named can I find 'Reason' the inevitable, or even the best, translation. But even supposing that there were in all the works of Aristotle (and some not by him) seventy-six places in which λόγος did mean Reason, there would be still an overwhelming probability against that meaning in any given place; that is, we ought to try in any given case to render the passage by the more usual translation—which is 'the formula of the essence' or 'the definition' or 'the rule' or 'the plan'—before resorting to the exceptional meaning. But so far from there being seventy-six such indubitable places, it is to be questioned if there are even six genuine places in which the translation must be Reason.

But it was no part of my intention to maintain that λόγος never meant Reason in Aristotle; I only desired to show that to translate it by Reason in the group of places to which Professor Wilson has drawn attention is never quite inevitable, and frequently involves a sacrifice of the meaning—especially that part of the meaning which consists in the reference to the cotemporary Academy. I had intended to append some more general account of the use of the term in Aristotle's works apart from the *Ethics*, but it does not now seem essential to my argument.

A. R. LORD.

*Rhodes University College,
Grahamstown, S.A.*

ON THE MEANING OF ΛΟΓΟΣ IN ARISTOTLE'S *ETHICS*.

I AM very sorry that Professor Cook Wilson has been induced to retract the interpretation of ὀρισμένη λόγῳ in *Eth. Nic.* 1107^a 1 which he has hitherto adopted.¹ His authority in such matters is so great that his pronouncement will be widely regarded as settling the question. At the same time I cannot help thinking that he has been too easily moved, and I venture most respectfully to submit one or two pleas in arrest of judgment.

I am not concerned with the difficulty which arises from rendering λόγος differently at 1104^b 23 and 1106^b 36 *sqq.*; for I take it to mean 'rule' in both passages. Nor am I troubled by the fact that τοῦ λόγου is introduced in the first passage without any explanation, though the definition has not yet appeared in the text and is not developed till later on. The theory of the λόγος or ὀρθὸς λόγος belongs to the Academy (κοινὸν καὶ ὑποκείσθω 1103^b 32) and was, of course, familiar to Aristotle's audience. The only points with which I have to deal are (1) the personification of the λόγος and (2) its relation to νόμος.

It must be remembered that λέγειν in Greek has an epitactic force like the French *dire* and the English 'tell'; and, when I translate it by 'rule,' I mean, in the first place, 'rule' in the sense in which we speak of a rule of conduct. This use of λόγος is found, for instance, in Plato's *Crito* 46^b. If the words ὡς ἐγὼ . . . οἷος τῶν ἐμῶν μηδενὶ ἄλλῳ πείθεσθαι ἢ τῷ λόγῳ stood alone, we should doubtless be tempted to render λόγος here by 'reason.' That cannot be right, however; for Socrates continues ὅς ἂν μοι λογιζομένῳ βέλτιστος φαίνεται, and we cannot attribute several 'reasons' to him. This is borne out by the words τοὺς δὴ λόγους οὕς ἐν τῷ ἔμπαρσθεν ἔλεγον, and a little later (46^d) this particular λόγος is referred to by the words πότερον καλῶς ἐλέγετο ἐκάστοτε ἢ οὐ, ὅτι . . . δεῖ κ.τ.λ. This may serve to justify the rendering 'rule' in all cases where there is a question of heeding or obeying a λόγος.

The same thing holds good with regard to passages where we read that the λόγος (or the ὀρθὸς λόγος) λέγει, κελεύει, προστάττει or the like. If λόγος is an epitactic 'rule,' there is no reason why it should not be personified just like νόμος, and we can quite well say ὁ νόμος λέγει, κελεύει, προστάττει. This consideration explains more than one difficult passage in Plato. In *Rep.* IV. 442^c 2 the only reading which has any authority is τὸ ὑπὸ τῶν λόγων παραγγελθὲν δεινὸν τε καὶ μῆ. The reading τοῦ λόγου here is merely a conjecture of Cardinal Bessarion's, and the editors follow him because they imagine λόγος to mean 'reason' and do not, therefore, understand the plural. If we translate 'rules' and identify these with the δόγματα ('rulings') of the ἄρχοντες (414^b), we shall see what the text means. In *Timaeus* 70^a we should be inclined to take τοῦ λόγου κατήκουσιν ὄν as the equivalent of τοῦ λογιστικοῦ κατήκουσιν ὄν, but two or three lines below we have the same thing referred to by the words τῷ τ' ἐπιτάγματι καὶ λόγῳ (πείθεσθαι) which can hardly mean anything but 'the order and rule.'

When the λόγος (or ὀρθὸς λόγος) is brought into connexion with the νόμος, it is to be understood, I think, as ὁ λέγει ὁ νόμος. This comes out very well in Plato's *Laws* 659^d where παιδεία is defined as ἡ παίδων ὁλκή τε καὶ ἀγωγή πρὸς τὸν ὑπὸ τοῦ νόμου λόγον ὀρθὸν εἰρημένον. Or, as in *Eth. Nic.* 1180^b 21 the νόμος is itself a 'rule' proceeding from φρόνησις and νοῦς, and differing from other λόγοι in virtue of its ἀναγκαστικὴ δύναμις. From this point of view there is no difficulty whatever in identifying ὀρθὴ τάξις with ὀρθὸς λόγος, and that without adopting the translation 'reason.'

I have still to deal with two passages where the ὀρθὸς λόγος seems to be explicitly identified with φρόνησις. These are:

(a) *Eth. Nic.* 1103^b 33, τί ἐστὶν ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος καὶ πῶς ἔχει πρὸς τὰς ἄλλας ἀρετάς.

(b) *Ib.* 1144^b 27, ὀρθὸς δὲ λόγος περὶ τῶν τοιούτων ἢ φρόνησίς ἐστιν.

¹ See above, pp. 113 *sqq.*

I believe that both these passages can be interpreted without making λόγος mean 'reason,' and I hope to show that they must be. We get the hint, I think, from 1138^b 32, where ὡς ὁ ὀρθὸς λόγος is paralleled by ὅσα ἡ ἱατρικὴ κελεύει καὶ ὡς ὁ ταύτην ἔχων. If now we remember such passages as *Met.* Λ, 3. 1070^a 30 ἡ γὰρ ἱατρικὴ τέχνη ὁ λόγος τῆς ὑγείας ἐστίν and *ib.* 4. 1070^b 32 ὑγίεια γάρ πως ἡ ἱατρικὴ, and if we bear in mind the whole doctrine of the formal and efficient cause which these passages involve, we shall easily understand how Aristotle could on occasion seem to identify the ὀρθὸς λόγος with the ἀρετὴ of φρόνησις. In fact, φρόνησις is the λόγος τῆς ἀρετῆς in exactly the same sense as ἱατρικὴ is the λόγος τῆς ὑγείας, and the ὀρθὸς λόγος in the soul of the φρόνιμος is *in a sense* (πως) φρόνησις, in the same sense, namely, that the λόγος of health in the soul of the ἱατρός (ὁ ταύτην ἔχων, sc. τὴν ἱατρικὴν) is the art of medicine. But the λόγος of health is clearly not 'reason' in any sense of that ambiguous term. It is the 'form' of health; and that form is also the

'rule' which prescribes the due κρᾶσις and συμμετρία of the 'opposites.' I cannot believe that any rendering of λόγος is admissible in the *Ethics* which is not applicable to the ἀρετὴ σώματος as well as to the ἀρετὴ ψυχῆς. The whole system depends on the parallelism of these two.

To avoid misunderstanding, I should add that I do not for a moment mean to imply any doubt that the λόγος of the *Ethics* is a *ratio*. I hold, on the contrary, that the *Ethics* is faithful to the Pythagorean tradition which extended the doctrine of ἀρμονία to medicine first and afterwards to conduct. I am only concerned to show how the idiom of the Greek language made it possible for this mathematical conception to acquire an imperative character.

I am not presuming to instruct Professor Cook Wilson in these matters; for in one way or another I learnt them mainly from him. My remarks are intended for those who still regard the *Ethics* as a self-explanatory work.

JOHN BURNET.

IN PROPERTIUM RETRACTATIONES SELECTAE.

I iv 16.

hoc magis accepta fallit uterque fide.

For *fallit* read *pallet* (= *perdite amat* as I i 22, I ix 17).

I vi 17.

osculaue opposito dicat sibi debita vento.

debita seems to require that *opposito* shall bear the sense of 'pledged'; if so, for *vento* we must substitute something capable of being pledged. I suggest

osculaue opposito dicat sibi debita voto.

I viii 46.

iusta meam norit gloria canitiem.

Read

iusta meam norit gloria canitiem.

Cf.

et vitae et morti gloria iusta meae (II i. 74).

I xvi 2.

ianua Tarpeiae nota pudicitiae.

No meaning can be found for *Tarpeiae*; the word is probably imported

from IV iv. Read either *patriciae* or *perpetuae*.

I xvi 47.

sic ego nunc dominae vitiis et semper *amantis* fletibus.

For *amantis*, a dittograph from v. 45, perhaps *inultis*.

I xvii 3.

nec mihi Cassiope solito visura carinam.

Read

nec mihi Cassiopa solvit Cynosura carinam.

Propertius is weather-bound at Cassiope (or Cassope). Cynosura would be a star of release to him, just as Calchas (in IV i 109):

Aulide . . . solvit . . . rates.

II i 37.

Theseus infernis, superis testatur Achilles
hic Ixioniden, ille Menoetiaden.

The context seems to require a concessive; read *testator*.

II iii 27.

non non humani partus sunt talia dona :
ista decem menses non peperere bona.

The text could be relieved of an improbable tautology by reading *non non humani captus*.

II vi 5.

nec quae {deletas *Nfv* } potuit componere
 {delectas *FDV* } Thebas.

deletas is, I fear, not sincere testimony. For *delectas* we may restore *desertas* with tolerable certainty, since at I xiii 16

et flere {inlectis } Galle diu manibus.
 {inlectis }

'*insertis* . . . manibus' alone gives the required gesture (*cf.* III xiv 30)—to clasp hands.

II vi 12.

me soror et cum qua dormit amica simul.

The low Latinity of *simul* for *uno in lecto* shows that this passage is rather deeply corrupted. I guess that *et cum qua* should be *quaecumque*, and that *simul* represents *sinu*. If *sinu*, then *tuo* is required. And one is forced to the painful conclusion that *soror* is a patch put on to mend the mischief which was caused by reading first *et cumque*, then *et cum qua* for *quaecumque*. We never hear of Cynthia having a sister; she wasn't the kind of woman that would have a sister; they did not hunt in couples at Rome as they did in a palatial. Read therefore

me quaecumque tuo dormit amica sinu.

II ix 13.

foedavitque comas et tanti corpus Achilli
maximaque in parva sustulit ossa manu.

Achilli is hardly credible after *Achillen* in v. 9. *Aen.* i 486 would suggest a reading:

et tanti corpus amici.

But perhaps some case of *Achions* is likelier.

15. For

cum tibi nec Peleus aderat nec caerula mater
read *cui tum*.

17.

tunc igitur {uiris FN } gaudebat Graecia natis.
 {ueris s }
 {castis DV }

curis, 'passionate devotion' (as in the Elegists *passim*), is the word which alike the reading of *FN* and the probabilities of the context commend. The variant in *DV* does not look like an interpolation, *veris* being so much more obvious. I take it there was (as is common in *MSS.*) an exchange of noun and epithet, *i.e.* the original of our *MSS.* bore

tunc igitur {curis } gaudebat Graecia {castis.
 {castis }

II x 23.

sic nos nunc, inopes laudis, conscendere carmen
pauperibus sacris vilia tura damus.

I showed (in *Classical Review*, 1911, p. 136) that the evidence of Val. Maximus, II viii 5 and V vi proves *inopes laudis* to be as inseparably single an epithet as if it were *inglorii*: which leaves *conscendere carmen* without any possible construction. I suggested *poscente camena*, to which a subsequent critic objected, not without reason. But *inopes laudis* still requires us to get rid of *conscendere carmen*.

Ovid, *ex Ponto* II i 57, furnishes a clue:

te quoque victorem Tarpeias scandere in arces
laeta coronatis Roma videbit equis.

Read

cum scandis in arcem.

carmen is an anagram of *narcem*.

II xiii 47.

quis tam longaeuae minuisset fata senectae
gallicus iliacis miles in aggeribus?
non aut Antilochi vidisset corpus humari
diceret aut 'O Mors, cur mihi sera venis?'

Some verses from A. L., *Carm. Epigr.* (Bücheler-Riese) will give the model for our first line:

quod si longa magis duxissent fila sorores (456).
quod si longa magis nexissent stamina Parcae (822).

quod si longa tuae mansissent tempora vitae (1166).

Just as one may certainly in I xix 17 for {longae te } restore *longaevae*, so here the converse error appears certain:

longa suae minuisset fata senectae.

Furthermore, the A. L. type is a conditional. Livineius saw that a conditional was wanted, but rather than

his *cui si tam longae* (which fails to account for *longaeuæ*) we must read :

qui si longa suae minuisset fata senectæ.

And now for the pentameter. Mr. Housman has made justly merry over the *gallicus* of the MSS. Among many silly suggestions (such as *bellicus*) Markland divined the necessary and perfect word, *saucius*. Most probably some lost Greek epigram in the manner of A. P. ix 157 on the theme ἔθανεν χῶ τριγέρων Πύλιος had the original of *saucius* in a *τραυματίας*. Cf. Dio. Chrys. xi 117 (p. 145, v. Arnim) ἐτρώθη δὲ καὶ αὐτὸς ὁ Μέρμων ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἀντιλόχου καὶ ἀποκομιζόμενος τραυματίας τελευτᾷ κατὰ τὴν ὁδόν. *Saucius miles* = *τραυματίας*. But Markland did not point out that the error arose from misreading (as anyone may do) an Irish elongated *u* as a double *l*. This and a similar Irish error (*ce* = *a*) account for the MSS. at IV xi 24 offering *falla* instead of *fauce*.

II xv 27, 8.

exemplo uinctæ tibi sint in amore columbæ
masculus et {^{totum O}
 {^{tutum s} } femina coniugium.

totum coniugium has no sense. St. Paulinus Nolanus, whose memory was stored with Propertian phrases, has a line which gives the hint how to emend it :

illa piaæ turtur cognata columbæ
(*Carm.* XXIII 11).

turtur femina and *columbus* or *columba masculus* make the perfect sentimental pair. Read :

exemplo uinctum tibi sint in amore columbus
masculus et turtur femina coniugium.

The arrangement of the apposition is both idiomatic and characteristically Propertian.

II xv 41.

qualem si cuncti {^{cuperent NDV}
 {^{vellent d}
 {^{vellem F} } decurrere uitam.

cuperent was too outrageously queer for the Humanists, who imported that *vellent*. *vellem* can hardly be anything but an interpolation. But we need do no violence to the MSS. if we read :

qualem si cuncti *inciperent* decurrere uitam.

Propertius uses *incipere* as a metrical

convenience (II xix 19, xv 33, III iv 16). Cf. Ter. *And.* 493.

II xvi 32.

an dolor hic vitiis nescit abesse suis ?

Surely this ought to be

an dolor *his* vitiis nescit abesse *suis* ?

The *vitia* do not belong to the *dolor*, but the *dolor* to the *vitia*.

II xxiv 13.

et cupit *iratum* talos me poscere eburnos.

The *et modo* of v. 11 requires us to replace *iratum* by *interdum*. Cf. I iii 41-43.

II xxv 1, 2.

unica nata meo pulcherrima cura dolori

excludit quoniam sors mea saepe {^{venit N'}
 {^{veni ceti.}

To begin with, can this astonishing *unica* be anything but *Cynthia*, with the initial left out for the rubricator to illumine ?

Cynthia, nata meo (pulcherrima cura) dolori.

To proceed: the vulgate text makes him promise Cynthia a literary immortality *because* she is so sparing of her favours: surely an unusual weakness in a poet, or even in a man, unless he were of the 'quite nice' kind: and it was not a quite nice person who penned

Falsa est ista tuæ, mulier, fiducia formæ.

I suppose, on the contrary, that he appeals to her to do something in return for which he promises her fame; and that v. 2 should begin with an imperative. The minimum of change gives us *exaudi* for *excludi*. The Ovid lexicon will furnish instances of *exaudi* = 'O hear my prayer.' Of the *tquoniam* one might make *atque utinam*. To provide a subjunctive, read *velis* for {^{venit}
 {^{veni} } of the MSS. Finally, for *sors*
 {^{venis}

mea, impossible as a vocative, *spes mea*.

exaudi, atque utinam, *spes mea*, saepe velis !

II xxv 39.

at vos qui officia in multos revocatis amores

quantum sic cruciat lumina {^{vestra DVs}
 {^{nostra NFL} } dolor !

For *officia*, metrically suspect and obscure in meaning, substitute *vacua*. *f* for *v* is a standard corruption in the

MS. tradition of Propertius (*e.g.* II vi 24). Mr. Housman has shown that *vacare* was written *vocare* (II xxvi 54). Possibly Propertius spelt *vacuus* in the archaic fashion as *vocivos*. *vacare* is well known as a technical term of erotic, meaning 'not to be in love with anybody just at present' (*e.g.* I xiii 2, I xix 6). The construction will be: 'at vos qui vacua lumina in multos amores revocatis, quantum (quantus *Heinsius*) sic dolor lumina vestra cruciat!'

II xxv 45.

illaque plebeio vel sit sandycis amictu.

I suggest

pallaque plebeio vel sit sandycina tinctu.

II xxvii 6. For

et maris et terrae caeca pericla *vīac*?

read

. . . caeca pericla *time*.

Time stands thus in IV i 150, and Lachmann reads in I v 8

molliter irasci non solet illa : *time*!

II xxviii 22.

haec eadem Persei nobilis uxor *erat* MSS.

Read *ovat*.

II xxix 3, 4.

obvia nescioquot pueri mihi turba minuta
venerat, hos vetuit me numerare timor.

Heinsius corrected *minuta* to *minuti*.

Propertius does use some pluperfects for aorists, but usually as a metrical convenience. If we accept Heinsius' correction, vastly superior in idiom and elegance as it is, not only the tense, but the number is offensive in *venerat*. He may say *obvia turba* because his verse will not admit *obviam*, but the *pueri minuti* remain the true subject. I suspect that he wrote

obvia *venerunt* pueri mihi turba minuti
nescioquot (vetuit me numerare timor),

in which *nescioquot* no longer disturbs the chiasmic symmetry, but directly adjoins the parenthesis which explains it.

II xxix 5.

aspice ut in toto nullus mihi corpore surgat
spiritus admisso notus adulterio.

For *notus* Marcilius conjectured *motus*, Burmann *natus*. Perhaps one should read:

spiritus admisso *sontis* adulterio,

'the (agitated) breathing of one who has been guilty of an act of adultery.' The ablative would be like

fraterno sanguine sontem (Ov. *M.* xi 268).

II xxix 41.

sic ego tam sancti $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{custodereludor } N \\ \text{custoderector } L \\ \text{custodisrector } F \\ \text{custosrecludor } DV \end{array} \right\} \text{amoris.}$

This jumble of rubbish yields a remarkable witness to the integrity of N; hardly more than a redivision of the letters is necessary, and you can see the original

casto dare ludos amori.

But the resulting

sic ego tam sancti casto dare ludos amori

had itself evidently been tampered with. I fancy that a further stage in the corruption was

casto,
sancto,

and the gloss being foisted into the text expelled the verb which is required to give a construction to *dare*, viz. *cogor*. Read:

sic ego tam sancto dare ludos cogor amori.

The genitives *sancti* . . . *amoris* were of course corruptions consequent upon *custode*.

II xxxii 3-6.

nam quid Praenesti dubias, O Cynthia, sortis,
quid petis Aeaei moenia Telegoni?

curva te } Herculeum deportant esseda Tibur?
cur vatem }

appia cur totiens te via $\left\{ \begin{array}{l} \text{ducit } Nf \\ \text{ducit } cell. \\ \text{ducis } s. \end{array} \right\} \text{anum } O. \\ \text{anus } vbs.$

In v. 5 *cur tua te* may be accepted as one of Baehrens' very few happy conjectures; for never had a scholar so good an eye for seeing where something was wrong with a text, and so bungling a touch for correcting it. V. 6 remains one of the famous cruces.

Now first note that since a town is named in each of the three preceding lines, we should expect yet another town to be named in v. 6. Next, that *te* . . . *anum*, if you bring the letters together, give the name of a town, a fashionable inland change from Baiae (Hor. *Epist.* I i 86), Teanum, commonly called Teanum *Sidicinum*. This word *Sidicina* I conjecture to be latent under the jumble of letters from which the

scribe of *N* faithfully, so far, copied *dicit* and not *ducit*. If *Sidicina* be right, then for *appia* we must restore *oppida*. *Teanum* was a gloss on *oppida Sidicina*.

teanum
oppida cur totiens ad Sidicina. . . .

via came in after *oppida* had been corrupted into *Appia*. What word, then, has *anum* expelled from the verse-ending? I cannot think of anything better than *redis* or *via est*, unless one prefers

oppida cur totiens te Sidicina vident?

Cf. a few lines lower down (9-10):

cur videt accensis devotam currere taedis
in (*read te*) Nemus et Triviae lumina ferre
deae?

15, 16.

et leviter {nymphis
lymphis} tota crepitantibus urbe
cum subito Triton ore recondit aquam.

There is no question of fountains playing all over the town, only in these particular gardens of the Porticus Pompeia. Read:

et leviter lymphis *torti* crepitantibus *imbres*
cum subito Triton ore *recludit* aquam.

61.

quod si tu Graias {tuque es *NFL*
sive es *DV*} imitata Latinas,
semper vive meo libera iudicio.

A reading which reconciles the two variants and suits the context is:

quod si tu Graias *vivesque* imitata Latinas
semper vive meo libera iudicio.

II xxxiv 83.

nec minor his animis, aut si (ut sit *Housman*)
minor ore, canorus
anseris indocto carmine cessit olor.

The soundness of the first half-line is remarkably confirmed by Paulinus Nolanus (xxvii 313):

unde mihi hos animos? quae me levat aura
superbum?

He is disclaiming the courage for epic adventure. Propertius' swan suggests to him the Horatian description of Pindar (*Odes*, IV ii 25).

93.

Cynthia quinetiam uersu laudata Properti,
hos inter si me ponere Fama uolet.

quinetiam probably conceals the missing future verb. Read:

Cynthia *vincet* eas (or *eam*) uersu laudata Pro-
perti.

III vii 45, 6.

viveret ante suos dulcis conviva Penates

pauper at { in terra } { nilubiflere *NLF* }
 { interea *F* } { nilnisiflere *DV* }
 { potest *O*.
 { potes *s*.

Let us start from these two fixed points: (1) No Latin writer could say *viveret conviva*, and (2) *viveret ante suos penates* is nonsense. Problem: to find a verb palaeographically apt for corruption into *viveret* and which suits the character *conviva* and the scene *ante Penates*. The word *biberet* fulfils all these conditions. The interchange of *b* and *v* is well known. The rearrangement of the words in the line is consequent upon this first error. Replace them therefore:

ante suos biberet dulcis conviva Penates.

And now that the central idea of the picture, viz. drinking, is restored, we have a clue to repair the pentameter by. Take the letters *ni* | *lubif* | *lere* *potens* and divide them at the uprights; three germane words begin faintly to appear. *ni* is for *ui*, that is, <g>*ui*, *lubif* is *bibit*, *lere* is *aere*. The last word should be *potens*:

ante suos biberet dulcis conviva Penates;

pauper, at interea (*F*) qui bibit, aere potens.

‘He would be drinking in jolly company by his fireside; not rich, but, never mind, while a man is drinking he is a millionaire for the time.’

potens with an ablative hardly needs an illustration, but Horace will serve:

Veneris muneribus potens (*Od.* IV x 1);

or Propertius:

nam quantum ferro tantum pietate potentes
(III xxii 21).

III viii 13.

custodum gregibus circa se stipat euntem,
seu sequitur medias, Maenas ut icta, vias;
seu timidam crebro dementia somnia terrent,
seu miseram in tabula picta puella movet.

The first of these lines plainly requires a *sive*; also it contains one plainly superfluous word *circa*. I take it that *circa* is a misreading of *sive ea*, and that the corruption has, as often happens, been patched over by rearrangement. Read:

sive ea custodum gregibus se stipat euntem etc.

This seems palaeographically easier than Heinsius'

custodum grege seu circa se stipat euntem,

or Burmann's

custodum gregibus seu quum se stipat euntem.

III ix 23-26.

cum tibi Romano dominas in honore securis

et liceat medio ponere iura foro,

uel tibi Medorum pugnaces ire per hostis

atque onerare tuam fixa per arma domum. . .

One simple hypothesis will explain all the complication of oddities in this passage: *Romano honore, dominas secures, Medorum hostis*.

It is to suppose that a vertical dislocation has taken place at the third letter in each of the three lines—*i.e.*, two words have been shifted up into the line above that where they ought to be.

24, 25 should then read:

et tibi Romano ponere iura foro

vel liceat medio pugnaces ire per hostes.

What about 23? We have to deal with

cum tibi dominas in honore securis

for I assume the *tibi* to be sound. What is to be supplied?—*i.e.*, What has *romano*, intruding from below, displaced here? The missing word must be (1) one that is liable to be confused with *romano*, and (2) a genitive to qualify *dominas*. *Terrarum* fulfils the conditions; so would *uel rerum*:

cum tibi terrarum dominas in honore securis,

or

cum tibi vel rerum dominas in honore securis.

Note that in II vii 15, for

quod si romanae comitarent castra puellae

(as I now agree with Scaliger and Passerat in reading), the MSS. offer

quod si uerameae.

J. S. PHILLIMORE.

The University, Glasgow.

REVIEWS

HUDE'S *LYSIAS*.

Lysiae Orationes recognovit brevique adnotatione critica instruxit CAROLUS HUDE, Ph.D. Pp. x+272 (the latter not numbered, except with the pages of Stephanus). Date of Preface, December 1, 1911; date of publication, December 19, 1912. Oxonii e Typographeo Clarendoniano. Cloth, 3s. 6d.; paper covers, 3s.

THE *editio princeps* of Lysias is included in the first volume of the *Orationes Rhetorum Graecorum* published by Aldus Manutius, Venice, 1513. Among later editions may be mentioned those of Henricus Stephanus in the *Oratores Graeci*, Paris, 1575; John Taylor, Cambridge, 1739; Reiske, Leipzig, 1772; and Auger, Paris, 1783. In the nineteenth century Lysias was edited, in the *Oratores Attici*, by Bekker, Oxford, 1822 f., and Berlin, 1823 f., and by Baiter and Sauppe, Zürich, 1838; and, separately, by Scheibe in 1852 (ed. 2, 1862), Westermann, 1854, Cobet, 1863, and

Herwerden, 1899. Scheibe's Teubner text is now superseded by that of Thalmheim, 1901. Among editions of *Select Speeches* may be named those with German notes by Rauchenstein in 1848 and Frohberger in 1866, which have been repeatedly revised since the above dates, and those with English notes by W. A. Stevens, Chicago, 1876 and 1878, and M. H. Morgan, Boston, 1895, and by R. C. Jebb, in *Selections from the Attic Orators*, 1880 and 1888, and E. S. Shuckburgh, 1882 and 1885, etc.

The primary MS of Lysias, Palatinus X, No. 88 in the Heidelberg Library, was written in the twelfth century by one Theodorus, a name very frequent in the Byzantine age. It was formerly preserved in Nicaea, the celebrated Bithynian city which, under Theodorus Lascaris (1206-1222), became for a time the capital of Western Asia. When the Greeks recovered Constantinople in 1261, the MS may well have been taken to the city which

continued to be their capital until its capture by the Turks in 1453. Even before the fall of Constantinople the MS (like many others) may have been removed to the safe seclusion of the monasteries of Mount Athos. In the preface to the *editio princeps*, Aldus Manutius, after mentioning Lysias and Aeschines, says that many of the speeches of the orators included in the same edition *latebant in Atho*, until Janus Lascaris, who had been sent to the East by Lorenzo dei Medici, brought these and many other MSS to Florence.¹ Later in the fifteenth century the primary MS was repeatedly transcribed, and some at least of these transcripts were probably made in Florence, where they are still preserved. Either the primary MS, or a transcript of the same, was used in Venice for the *editio princeps* in 1513. From Venice or Florence this primary MS may have been taken to Heidelberg by one of the several scholars who formed the links between Italy and Germany during the Revival of Learning. When Heidelberg was captured by Tilly in 1622, the library of the capital of the Palatinate was assigned, as part of the spoils of war, to Maximilian of Bavaria, and was presented by him to Pope Gregory XV, who sent a renegade Greek, Leo Allatius, to superintend its transfer to the Vatican in the following year. Sauppe begins the sentence, in which he correctly states the vicissitudes of the MS, with the following words: 'Ex Italia Heidelbergam allatus est, Heidelbergam Leo Allatius anno 1622 Romam abstulit . . .' Dr. C. Hude, the editor of the text now under review, condenses the whole sentence thus: 'Ex Italia

Heidelbergam allatus est, anno 1622 Romam revertit, anno 1797 Lutetiam Parisiorum asportatus est, anno denique 1815 Heidelbergam rediit.' The words which I have printed in italics, *Romam revertit*, imply that the MS was formerly in Rome, and that it naturally returned thither, whereas it seems more probable that it was formerly in Venice or in Florence.

Dr. Hude, a member of the Royal Danish Academy and Rector of the Danish School of Frederiksborg, north of Copenhagen, is already favourably known to scholars as an editor of Herodotus in the same series, and of two editions of Thucydides, published by Teubner. For the present text of Lysias he has himself minutely collated the Heidelberg MS, which had already been collated, in whole or in part, or specially examined, by at least nine other scholars. He has also recorded nearly all the readings of the fifteenth-century Florence MS, C (Laur. lvii. 4), which Bekker made the basis of his text of 1822 f., but which Sauppe in his celebrated *Epistola ad Hermannum* (1841) proved to be only an intelligently copied and occasionally interpolated transcript of X. Thus the readings of this MS, where it diverges from X, are of no primary authority, but are to be regarded as the conjectures of a capable Greek scholar. Some good examples of the corrections tacitly introduced by this copyist may be gleaned from Dr. Hude's critical notes: *Or.* 14 § 14, οἱ δὲ φίλοι (for φίλοι) ἐστρατεύοντο; *Or.* 19 § 50, Ἀθηναίων πάντων (for ἀπόντων) ἀκηκοῦτων; and *Or.* 23 § 14, ἐπισκεψάμενος (for ἐπισκεψάμενος) . . . τῷ μάρτυρι οὐκ ἐπέξῃλθεν. Dr. Hude agrees with Sauppe in his general opinion of C, and states the result of his own record of its readings in the following terms: 'Quicumque hanc editionem cum superioribus comparaverit, facile apparebit [some scholars might prefer the personal *intellect* to the impersonal *apparebit*] multas bonas scripturas quae vulgo Stephano, Contio, aliis imputantur re vera huic librario deberi.' 'Stephanus' is obviously Henricus Stephanus, the editor and printer of the Paris edition of 1575. For 'Contius' we have to turn to the pre-

¹ Beriah Botfield's Prefaces to the *Editiones Principes*, p. 298. The inventory of Janus Lascaris' MSS, published by K. K. Müller in the *Centralblatt f. Bibl.* i (1884) 333 f., includes on p. 374 *Διοχίνων λόγοι* and *Δυσίου ἀπολογία β*, which Müller proposes to identify with Laur. lvii. 4 (= C), a corrected and interpolated transcript of the primary MS (X), whereas the Aldine text is mainly founded on the primary MS (or an exact transcript of it). Thus in 19 § 22 it has *μῆς εἰπὼν κατεχρήσατο* with X, whereas C has *λαβὼν*; in 14 § 14, *φίλοι* with X (*ψίλοι* C); 19 § 50, *ἀπόντων* with X (*ἀπάντων* C). Possibly therefore X, with which the Aldine generally agrees, was brought by Janus Lascaris from Mount Athos.

face of Auger's Paris edition of 1783, where we find (on p. xiii) that 'Antonius Contius' was a native of Nyon (on the Lake of Geneva); that he distinguished himself as a lawyer in Orleans and Bourges, where he died in 1586; that he entered in the margin of his copy of the Aldine text of 1513 a number of emendations and typographical memoranda which appeared to imply that he was meditating a text of his own, and that the volume (now in the Paris Library) was placed in Auger's hands by De Cissé, Bishop of Auxerre. It is not, however, certain that the emendations were made by Conti himself; like the *marginalia* in other copies of the Aldine text, they may have been transcribed from some other source (cp. Erdmann's *Lysiaca*, p. 4, n. 3). All these emendations were regarded as original, and were recorded by Auger at the end of his second volume. This is stated in a shorter form on p. viii of the preface to Thalheim's edition of 1901: (editionis Aldinae) 'ex exemplo . . . nunc Parisino Augerus in editione (Par. 1783) Antonii Contii emendationes deprompsit, qui natus Novioduni, doctissimus IC, Bituricae mortuus est 1586.' As there are many other persons of the name of Conti, and two or three of the name of Antonio Conti in *Nouvelle Biographie Générale*, where there is no notice of the critic of the text of Lysias, the bare mention of the name of Contius in Hude's preface is inadequate, and some further details are necessary. Again, in *Or.* 10 §§ 23, 28, Hude as well as Thalheim ascribes certain conjectures to 'Brulart,' but it is only from Thalheim's preface that we can readily learn that Brulart was a Bishop of Sillery, who died in 1714, and whose conjectures were entered in the margin of a copy of Stephanus' text now in the Paris Library.

An examination of the critical notes shows that more than ninety scholars have already contributed towards the correction of the text of Lysias. Six of these are justly mentioned with honour in the preface: Taylor, Markland, Reiske, Bekker, Dobree, Sauppe. Three of these belong to Cambridge: Jeremiah Markland of Peterhouse, John

Taylor of St. John's, and Peter Paul Dobree of Trinity. Markland's emendations were published in the editions of Taylor and Reiske, while Dobree's were posthumously printed in his *Adversaria*. One would gladly have seen the names of some editors of *Select Speeches*, such as Rauchenstein and Frohberger, and of the whole of Lysias, such as Cobet and Thalheim, duly recorded by the latest editor of the text. Cobet's interesting preface includes four pages of parallel columns setting forth the errors of the Palatine MS and the corrections of Cobet's predecessors, and thirteen comparing the readings of the MS with the great Dutch critic's own emendations. Thalheim, again, gives us four pages of bibliography, including the names and dates of previous editors, and an alphabetical list of fifty-three comparatively recent scholars, with references to the articles or dissertations in which they have dealt with the text. The page and a half remaining blank at the end of Hude's preface leaves room for some slight expansion in this direction in a future issue. Many English students will possess no other copy of the text than the present excellent edition, and, in their interest, as well as in justice to previous critics of the text, some such expansion is eminently desirable. Some notes and suggestions on the text may here be added:

Or. 2 (*Epitaphios*), §§ 24-28. In the critical notes Dr. Hude states that 'Aldus,' that is the *editio Aldina* of 1513, has ἐπήγγειλαν for ἀπήγγειλαν in § 26, and ἐξόν for ἐξόν γάρ in § 28. But neither of these variants can possibly be attributed to 'Aldus,' since the whole of the passage beginning with ἀποθανεῖν in § 24 and ending with Ἑλλησπόντου in § 28, in which these variants occur, is omitted in the printed text of the Aldine edition, which draws special attention to the *lacuna* by a blank containing the words λείπει πολὺ, the amount omitted being about equivalent to a small octavo page of text. But, in a copy of that edition in the Leyden Library, the missing passage is supplied in *manuscript*, possibly (as has been suggested) by Paulus Manutius, with a view to a new edition of his father, Aldus Manutius' text of 1513. The above variants are in the *manuscript* addition to the Leyden copy, and ought to have been assigned, not to 'Aldus,' but to the *margo exempli Leidensis editionis Aldinae*, Dr. Hude's abbreviation for which is 'marg. Ald.'

The evidence as to the *marginalia* in six

copies of the Aldine text has been partially collected with care in Erdmann's *Lysiae* (Strassburg, 1891). But, on the two copies in Cambridge, he quotes Taylor, at second hand, as quoted by Reiske: *exemplar alterum collegio D. Joannis . . . legavit . . . Matthaeus Prior; alterum in bibliotheca J. Mori episcopi Eliensis asservatur*. He conjectures that the latter personage was 'Joannes Morus, Prediger in York †1592, . . . Socius in Collegio Christi.' But John More, Fellow of Christ's, was not a preacher in York; he was known as the 'Apostle of Norwich,' and was never Bishop of Ely. The person in question was obviously John Moore, Fellow of Clare and Bishop of Ely (†1714), whose celebrated library was bought by George I. and presented to the University of Cambridge. Taylor, who was University Librarian 1731-4, was perfectly familiar with this fact, and, indeed, at the end of the sentence correctly copied by Reiske, but incompletely quoted by Erdmann, actually adds: *Quam totam magnificentia vere regia et liberalitate nunquam satis praedicanda Academiae Cantabrigiae donavit Rex Optimus Georgius I. (Praefatio dated 1738, p. xxvi).*

Or. 7 (de olea sacra), § 1, οὕτως ἀπροσδοκῆτως αἰρίας καὶ πονηροῖς συκοφάνταις περιπέπτωκα. Thalheim and Hude agree in rejecting Taylor's alteration of ἀπροσδοκῆτως into ἀπροσδοκήτοις, which, however, is accepted by Cobet. Taylor was in fact justified in expecting an adjective before αἰρίας as a necessary parallel to πονηροῖς before συκοφάνταις, but ἀπροσδοκήτοις is not a true parallel to πονηροῖς. Accordingly, I suggest that the missing adjective is αἰσχροῖς. Such a word might easily have dropped out, owing to its beginning and ending with the same syllables as the next word—αἰρίας. This suggestion is confirmed by § 41 of the same speech, where the same disgraceful charges are referred to in the phrase ἐπ' αἰσχίστοις αἰρίας, also by

Or. 6, § 44, ἐπ' αἰσχροῖς αἰρίας, Or. 10, § 26, οὕτως αἰσχροῖς αἰρίας (αἰσχροὺς αἰρίαν Reiske), Or. 16, § 12, δίκην αἰσχροῖς, Or. 21, § 18, αἰσχροῖς δίκας, and Deinarchus, Or. 1, § 93, περὶ αἰσχροῖς αἰρίας κοινῇ πάντες ἀγωνιζόμεθα. All these passages tend to support my proposal that the text should run: οὕτως ἀπροσδοκῆτως αἰσχροῖς αἰρίας καὶ πονηροῖς συκοφάνταις περιπέπτωκα.

Or. 30 (in Nicomachum), § 6, ὑμᾶς τοῖνον χρή, . . . ἐπειδὴ ἐνὸς ἐκάστου δίκην οὐκ εἰλήφατε, νῦν ὑπὲρ πάντων γοῦν τὴν τιμωρίαν ποιήσασθαι. Here Hude regards γοῦν as *vix sanum*. Thalheim, on the other hand, endeavours to defend it by quoting *Or. 25, § 4, ταῦτα γοῦν*. But ταῦτα γοῦν presents no difficulty, because γοῦν ('at all events') there draws a contrast between a *part* and a preceding *whole*; as elsewhere, between *one* or a *few* and a preceding *all* or *many* (cp. 6, § 44, ἐν γοῦν, and 10, § 21, ἐγὼ γοῦν). The real difficulty lies in the contrast between πάντων and the preceding ἐνὸς ἐκάστου. It may, however, be suggested that, although, at first sight, πάντων γοῦν, 'all at any rate,' is apparently wrongly contrasted with the preceding ἐνὸς ἐκάστου, 'each single individual,' the real contrast is between condemning all *at once* and condemning several individuals *seriatim*. πάντων (= ἅμα πάντων) is stronger than πάντων, and is practically equivalent to ἀπαξ πάντων. Thus the *single* notion of the condemnation of all at one fell swoop is contrasted with the *series* of condemnations of the several persons previously mentioned; so that we here have a contrast between a single thing and a preceding plural, which is in accordance with the regular usage of γοῦν. No such attempt to defend the text would have been necessary, if we had found in the MSS νῦν γοῦν ὑπὲρ πάντων τὴν τιμωρίαν ποιήσασθαι.

J. E. SANDYS.

St. John's House, Grange Road, Cambridge.

APOLLONIUS RHODIUS.

The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius.

Edited with Introduction and Commentary by GEORGE W. MOONEY, M.A., Fellow and Tutor of Trinity College, Dublin. Pp. 454. Dublin University Press Series, 1912.

MR. MOONEY is justified in claiming the merit of freshness for his edition of the *Argonautica* with an English commentary, as the last edition by an Englishman was made nearly a century and a half ago. But Mr. Mooney has given us here an edition which, besides being fresh, is quite satisfactory and shows a thorough acquaintance with the principal work that has been done in this field up to the present time. The

literature is, as he remarks, very scattered and in many cases unprocurable, for Apollonius is a favourite subject for German dissertations. After all is said however, our ignorance of his life is so great that we know neither the date of his birth or death nor even whether he was, as tradition says, in the list of Librarians of the Alexandrian Library. The prevailing opinion among scholars now is that he was not. The tradition, as it appears in the anonymous *Lives* of Apollonius and in Suidas, is treated as of no account and rejected on chronological grounds. These grounds, if certain, must be conclusive, but they themselves rest on doubtful interpretations of passages in Callimachus and

other authors. Some scholars seem to regard a tradition that a certain event happened as equivalent to proof that it did not happen. The subject of the dates of Apollonius is too long to discuss here and Mr. Mooney is far removed from the dogmatic scepticism to which I have alluded. He just states the meagre facts we possess and leaves the question, and, after all, it makes no difference to our appreciation of the *Argonautica* whether its author was librarian or not. The Ritschelian hypothesis that Eratosthenes resigned the librarianship before his death and was succeeded by Apollonius, solves several difficulties and is not put out of court by the arbitrary statement of Couat, or, 'si quelque chose est certain dans l'histoire littéraire de l'école d'Alexandrie, c'est précisément ce fait que les bibliothécaires en titre gardaient leur charge toute leur vie.' At the same time Couat has given perhaps the best account of the tangled chronology of the Alexandrian writers, while Susemihl's is probably the worst. Much the same may be said of the famous quarrel between Apollonius and Callimachus. We know nothing of the circumstances, when it arose, or how long it lasted. The saying of Callimachus quoted in connexion with the quarrel, 'A great book is a great evil,' is supposed to refer to the *Argonautica*, but the Provost of King's College, Cambridge, regards it as an allusion to the experience of Callimachus as a librarian, and to nothing else. It is a natural remark for a librarian, but as it has been handed down as connected with the quarrel, may we not credit Callimachus with sufficient humour (not much is required) to have used the expression with a double meaning? It is obvious to any one who compares the concluding lines of the *Hymn to Apollo* with Apoll. Rhod. iii. 932 ff., that the two passages are related, but which is the earlier, and whether either of them is a later addition to its context, we do not know and probably never shall know. Many combinations, more or less plausible, have been proposed.

Mr. Mooney gives an interesting account, chiefly derived from the valuable scholia, of the sources from which

Apollonius drew, and some good criticism on the poem itself. There is one sentence however to which objection may be made. He says that by the portraiture of Medea 'called by fate to a new and strange destiny, made the instrument for the fulfilment of the purposes of gods and men, smitten by a love which her young heart cannot understand, though it obeys its impulses, we are moved in a way in which the widowed Dido with her mad infatuation, amid the hum and bustle of rising Carthage, moves us not.' I do not propose to discuss this, because the superiority of Virgil to Apollonius even in the love episode is *res iudicata*. Individual critics, no doubt, have their eccentricities, and, with all respect, I must regard the above judgment as an eccentricity of Mr. Mooney. There is nothing very tragic in the Medea of Apollonius. After a *début* of successful crime we leave her on the threshold of what promises to be a prosperous career in Thessaly.

The text of the present edition, as Mr. Mooney says (I will call him M. to save space), is to a large extent the same as my own in the Oxford Classical Series, hence I cannot be expected to criticise it severely. Since the Oxford text was published (1900), vol. iv. of the Oxyrhynchus Papyri (1904) confirms Porson's conjecture *ναντίλοι* in III. 745 for *ναῦται* of codd.: *accedat textui*. *Ναῦται* is suspect because of the lengthening of the last syllable before a vowel without a pause in the sense. Also in I. 372 Bergk's *πρώειραν ἔσω* is confirmed, as Prof. Fitch has pointed out (*Amer. Journ. Phil.* No. 121), by a quotation of the line in Etymologicum Genuinum—a name given by Reitzenstein to an earlier form of the Etymologicum Magnum. The best codd. have *πρώραν ἔσω*. The usual reading is *πρώραν εἶσω* or *ἔσσω*. M. offers very few conjectures of his own. In I. 517 for the corrupt *ἡ θέμις ἐστὶ τέως ἐπὶ τε γλώσσησι χέοντο* he ingeniously reads *ἡ θέμις ἐστηώτες ἐπὶ γλ. χ.* In I. 987 codd. have *ἐκ δ' ἄρα τοίγῃ | νῆα Χυτοῦ λιμένος προτέρου ἐξήλασαν ὄρμου* which Merkel has corrected by *Χυτὸν λιμένα*. M. conjectures *νῆα Χυτοῦ λιμένος προτέρου ἐξήλασαν ὄρμον*, 'to the mooring-place of the harbour called Chytus,' which I

do not consider to be as good as Merkel's, προτέρου ὄρμου referring back to Καλὸς λιμὴν of 954. In II. 160, where codd. have ἀγχιάλῳ, τῇ καὶ τῇ περὶ πρυμνήσι' ἀνῆπτο, M. conjectures ἀγχ., τῇ ἀκτῇ ἔπι, πρ. ἀν. Merkel's τῇ καὶ τε περὶ πρ. ἀν. is simpler, περί being taken adverbially.

IV. 1646.

ὑπαὶ δέ οἱ ἔσκε τένοντος
σύριγξ αἰματόεσσα κατὰ σφυρόν· αὐτὰρ
ὁ τήνγε
λεπτὸς ὑμῆν, ζωῆς, ἔχε, πείρατα καὶ
θανάτοιο.

M. reads ὁ τ' ἦγχε for ὁ τήνγε, translating, 'the thin membrane, which compressed this, controlled the issues of life and death.' He adds the comment, 'The reading of the MSS. is certainly corrupt, as it involves governing τήνγε by ἔχε, taking πείρατα in app. with ὑμῆν, while ὁ is meaningless. Brunck's ὁ τῆς γε . . . ὑμῆν is not epic.' But I would reply (1) ὁ τ' ἦγχε is not epic, inasmuch as the article when used as a relative does not precede the antecedent, see Monro *H. G.* § 262; (2) ὁ is not 'meaningless' as it anticipates λεπτὸς ὑμῆν, and this anticipatory use is common in epic, *H. G.* § 258; (3) I do not take πείρατα in apposition with ὑμῆν but with τήνγε. The sentence is awkward certainly, but if a conjecture is necessary I prefer Brunck's τῆς γε, though not epic, to M.'s.

The commentary is just what is wanted for university students. Concise and lucid, it gives enough assistance without withdrawing the necessity for independent thought. I will devote the rest of my space to a few remarks upon passages where I find reason to differ from the editor's views, but I do so in some cases with hesitation and in all with respect.

The *Argonautica* begins with an invocation to Apollo which occupies four lines. Then the narrative begins Τοῖνυν γὰρ Πελλίης κ.τ.λ. In l. 8 all the MSS. (except one inferior one which has τοῖνυν) have δηρὸν δ' οὐ μετέπειτα τεῖν κατὰ βάζιν Ἰήσων. All modern scholars have objected to τεῖν and propose various emendations, θεῖν, αὐτήν, ἐτέην. The last, which is Merkel's, is perhaps the

least unsatisfactory. M., however, in agreement with Samuelsson (*Ad. Apoll. Rhod. Adversaria*, p. 3) defends τεῖν on the ground that 'the poet is anxious to show the intimate connexion of Apollo with the expedition, and his responsibility therefor.' But neither of them meets the real objection to τεῖν which is, that it is not in accordance with epic convention that, after the invocation, reference should be made to it, and it is improbable that Apollonius would violate this convention. These invocations, as is well known, were often detachable and could be fitted on as required. We finish with the invocation of Apollo at l. 4. What Mr. Mooney has not done, and what he has to do, is to parallel this reference to the invocation in the narrative. Scholars have felt this to be the difficulty, and if τεῖν had been defensible some one would have attempted the defence long before now. In I. 103 M. in common with editors since Brunck reads κοινὴν ὁδόν which has very slight MS. authority. Hart (1863) emended to κείνην which is the reading of the first hand in *Guelph. Laur.* has κεινήν. I do not hesitate to accept κείνην as correct. The fatal objection to κοινὴν is the form. It would be ξυνήν. I. 269, ὡς ἔχετο κλαίουσ' ἀδινώτερον, ἤτε κούρη . . . μύρεται. M. is doubtful whether ἤτε means 'as' or 'than.' Whatever be the meaning in *Il.* IV. 277, μελάντερον ἤτε πίσσα, I think that here ἤτε means 'as' because of μύρεται and so Leaf (*ad Il. l. c.*) takes it. With the meaning 'than' we should have no finite verb following. I. 934, διάνδιχα νηὸς ἰούσης. I am now of opinion that de Mirmont is right in his interpretation, viz. that διάνδιχα refers to the shifting of the sail from one side to the other to catch the wind, and is illustrated by Catullus iv. 19-21 and Virgil, *Aen.* v. 831. In I. 1216 ἀνίη with ἷ is, I think, indefensible. Merkel's ἀτη improves the sense as well as the metre. II. 590, ὅσσον δ' ἂν ὑπέκαθε νηὺς ἐρέτησιν, | δις τόσον ἀψ' ἀπόρουσεν. M. defends ἂν as iterative, but iterative ἂν is only found with the apodosis. Herwerden's ἄρ' is perhaps the best correction. II. 1179, οὐδέ μιν ἄνδρες | λήθομεν ἔμπεδον, οἳ τε θεοῦδέες οὐδὲ δίκαιοι. M. translates 'who are god-fearing and unjust,' which

is a contradiction. How can the same people be both *θεουδέες* and *οὐ δίκαιοι*? We should expect a reference to two classes, but the Greek will not permit of this. The Homeric *ὑβρισταί τε καὶ ἄγριοι οὐδὲ δίκαιοι* is not parallel in sense, for there the same people are referred to. M. adds, 'the conjecture *ἡδέ* for *οὐδέ* is easy but bad.' Possibly, but some emendation is called for. On III. 26, *ὀτρύνομεν* (aor. subj.) M. remarks: 'The only example in Apollonius of a subjunctive with short vowel from a non-sigmatic aorist. There is one in Hom. also, *ἐπεντύνονται*, *Od.* 24, 89.' There is some confusion here. In Homer, as is well known, the short vowel is peculiar to the subjunctive of non-thematic tenses, not merely to the subjunctive of the sigmatic aorist. Thus *ὀτρύνομεν* (aor. subj.) occurs three times in Homer, being the subjunctive of *ὠτρυνάω* and therefore non-thematic. As an aorist subjunctive form *ἐπεντύνονται* is quite regular; the difficulty is that in *l. c.* we have a subjunctive referring to past time, which is non-Homeric. III. 91, *πίθοιτό κεν ὕμμι μάλιστα, | ἢ ἐμοί*. M. might have illustrated *μάλιστα ἢ* from *Oxyg. Pap.* Vol. VII., No. 1015, where we find in a panegyric poem *τῷ σ' ἐπὶ τοῖσι μάλιστα γεραίρομεν ἢ περ ἐκείνοις*. III. 321, *ὑπὸ δούρασι πεπτηῶτας*. M. takes Madvig's emendation *ἐπὶ* and translates 'having fallen on some timbers;' but surely this is unnecessary, for *ὑπὸ* can be taken by tmesis with *πεπτηῶτας* (*πτήσσω*), 'crouching on the beams.'

III. 641.

ἔμπα γε μὴν θεμένη κύνεον κέαρ, οὐκέτ' ἀνευθεν
αὐτοκασινγήτης πειρήσομαι, εἰ κέ μ' ἀέθλω
χραιοσμεῖν ἀντιάσῃσιν, ἐπὶ σφετέροις
ἀχέουσα
παισί· τό κέν μοι λυγρὸν ἐνὶ κραδίῃ
σβέσει ἄλγος.

This is a difficult passage, but I think M. in his rendering mistakes the sense. He translates, 'nevertheless, though I have banished shame from my heart, I will not yet essay aught without my sister, if haply she entreat me to aid them in their task through anguish for her sons,' etc. (1) *οὐκέτι* is translated

as if it were *οὐπω*, (2) *θεμένη* is not concessive but rather causal in sense, (3) *εἰ* is not conditional but introduces an object clause after *πειρήσομαι*. I take *οὐκέτ' ἀνευθεν* as = *οὐκέτ' ἀνευθεν οὔσα* and translate (as in fact it stands in my translation): 'Yet, taking to myself a reckless heart, I will no more keep aloof but will make trial of my sister to see if she will entreat me to aid in the contest, through grief for her own sons,' etc. III. 1383, *τοὺς δε καὶ ἄχρῖς | ὥμων τελλομένους*. On *ὥμων* M. remarks: 'this word has been suspected, but it is defended by the fact that Val. Fl. (7, 619) mentions those whose heads only were above the ground, 'necdum *humeri* videre diem.' M. does not meet the difficulty. The suspicion attaching to *ὥμων* is not to the word itself but to its position. Apollonius mentions (1) those earth-born men who had risen halfway out of the ground, (2) those who were out as far as the shoulders, (3) those who had completely risen. We should expect the order to be (2) (1) (3). To meet this abnormal gradation *γούνων* and *κώλων* have been suggested. But I think the difficulty is much mitigated, if not abolished, if the words *τοὺς . . . τελλομένους* are taken parenthetically. M. defends III. 1393 *οἱ μὲν ὀδάξ τετρηχότα βῶλον ὁδοῦσιν | λαζόμενοι πρηνεῖς*, by the remark, 'the pleonasm is merely apparent, as *ὀδάξ* and *ὁδοῦς* are probably from different roots.' That may be so, still it seems to me intolerable. Hermann suggests *ἀρούρης* which he thinks was displaced by *ὁδοῦσιν* a gloss on *ὀδάξ*. I think this quite possible in spite of the somewhat arbitrary statement of M. 'such a familiar word would not require a gloss.'

IV. 501.

ῥηιδίῃ δέ κεν ἄμμι, κεδασθέντων δίχα
λαῶν,
ἦδ' εἷη μετέπειτα κατερχομένοισι κέλευ-
θος.

M. adopts Merkel's conjecture of *ἦ τ'* for *ἦδ'*, but whatever objection may be made to *ἦδ'* there is far greater objection to *ἦ τ'*, for it involves (1) the separation of *κεν* from *εἷη* by *ἦ* which seems impossible, (2) taking *κατερχο-*

μένοισι apart from ἄμμι and without any construction—at least I suppose that as M. adopts Merkel's conjecture he also adopts his explanation.

There are two useful appendices, first, on the double recension of the *Argonautica* about which our information is very defective, and, second, on the metre.

The edition might have been made still more complete by some disquisition upon the grammar of Apollonius, but it seems ungracious to ask for more when we are given so much that is valuable.

R. C. SEATON.

KRAMER'S VALERIUS FLACCUS.

C. Valeri Flacci Setini Balbi Argonauticon Libri Octo. Edidit OTTO KRAMER. 1 vol. Pp. lxxxvi + 218. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. M. 3.20; bound M. 3.60.

AN unkind star seems to watch over the Teubner editions of Valerius Flaccus. That of 1875 was simply a re-writing of the *Argonautica* by Baehrens, and Kramer's, which would otherwise have been worthy of the great series in which it appears, is spoiled by a very serious error of judgment. If we take the fifty to sixty scholars who have handled the poem since, say, the appearance of the Juntine and Aldine editions, and reckon up the number of times the conjectures of each are admitted to the text of this edition, we find that, after Heinsius, whose total is between 70 and 80, only three critics reach double figures. One of them is Burmann, with 16 successes; another, Gronov, with 12; the third is Sigfrid Sudhaus, and his score is 43. Of these emendations I reckon three good enough for their position (IV. 426 *quem sors*, V. 269 *ipsumque ut*, VIII. 62 *me patiens*), five worth mention in the apparatus (II. 103, 136, III. 575, 622, VI. 696), twenty-one possible but superfluous, as being at any rate in no way superior to the MS. reading or the Vulgate, and fourteen frankly impossible.

A few examples will, I think, justify the stress I am laying on this unfortunate feature of an otherwise excellent book. In I. 491 *V* reads 'compressus pectore tigres,' which is certainly puzzling: K. has, from Sudhaus, *compressans*. In II. 439 Valerius tells us how the Samothracian priest initiates the Argonauts in the local mysteries, and then, suddenly checking himself, says

'hactenus in populos uati Samothraca diemque | missa mane,' as is generally read, with no very violent change from

V's 'uates amothraca ^e*dicam*.'¹ Kramer does not mention the Vulgate, and reads 'h. in p. uates, Samothracia, dicam: | missa mane.' Anything worse than this conjecture of Sudhaus, with its absolute 'dicam in populos,' feeble 'uates,' abrupt and meaningless 'missa mane,' I can hardly imagine, and the fact that a perfectly unobjectionable correction already existed makes it worse. The extraordinary thing is that the apparatus reveals the fact that Sudhaus himself offered it '*dubitanter*'! In VI. 152 we are told of a nation of wizards: 'omnibus in superos saeuus (h)onor.' Metre and sense are certainly unsatisfactory. Sudhaus' *sonor* gets rid of one difficulty, but what does it mean? We are referred to *magico sono* in VII. 389, but my difficulty is not in understanding what a *saeuus sonor* is—the twentieth century knows that only too well—but in connecting the phrase with *in superos*. Perhaps the most lamentable specimen of all is to be found at VI. 553, where we read how Argus brings down two horsemen: *utrumque ab equis ingenti porrigit auso*, as K. prints it, taking presumably *porrigit* in the sense of *sternit*, for which I know no parallel. It is true that *V*'s *auro* makes no sense either, but the obvious and necessary *aruo* appeared in the Juntine edition some four hundred years ago. This reading is not even mentioned in the apparatus: its correctness may be seen by comparing not

¹ *V* continually omits *que*, e.g. four times in Bk. I. *Missa in diem* is of course equivalent to *in lucem producta*.

only the Homer and Vergil passages cited by Langen, but Liv. X. 10. 10 'in spatium ingens ruentem porrigit hostem.'

Elsewhere, where his old teacher's conjectures are not concerned, Kramer shows sound judgment, distinguishing with marked success between the emendation that deserves a place in the text, that which should be mentioned, and that which should be ignored. Only in this last category do I think he has been a little too severe: apart from the cases quoted above, I have noted sixteen conjectures in the first four books with which the hastiest reader of Valerius can hardly dispense.¹ K.'s own positive contributions to the text are not very convincing, though *faxo* for *fas* in V. 670 is worth consideration and his rejection of *C* at VII. 373 and discovery of

oscula miscet in *V*'s mysterious *quâ* extremely ingenious and probable.² But his use of a remedy which I believe to be the only cure for many desperate passages of ancient authors, the assumption of a lacuna, is most happy, nowhere more so than at VII. 186, where he has quite convinced me that *V*'s *amplexumque petit* is sound and refers to Juno's reception of Venus' offer, some such line as 'talìa iactantem blandis Saturnia dictis' having fallen out before it.

The Introduction, a model of clearness and Latinity, deals wholly with textual matters. First, with the Vatican MS., which K. has himself examined. Here he discusses at length the passages in which he assumes the existence of lacunae, shows that Kennerknecht's transposition at I. 403 *sqq.* is

needless (there are 42 oarsmen, and the 21 on Hercules' side of the ship are enumerated first), and gives an account of *V*'s fifteenth-century copies. Passing next to the lost St. Gall MS. he declares it be a direct copy of *V*, and gives some interesting descriptions of certain peculiarities in *V*'s script or condition which he thinks misled the scribe of *S*: e.g. *V* at II. 376 reads *segni*, but the writing on the other side of the page shows through and makes it look so like *segnis* that one collator has actually recorded this to be its reading. And *segnis* is the reading of *S*. The Paris excerpts are dismissed as having no independent value and then the rest of the Introduction—nearly one half of the whole—is concerned with the famous 'tenth century' MS. of Carrio. That scholar's good faith is vigorously maintained, but K. doubts his power to date his MS. accurately at the age of 18, and believes it to belong to the fifteenth-century interpolated class. He argues that in several passages where *C*'s reading is generally preferred to *V*'s, the latter is really right, proving his case, to my mind at all events, as regards II. 294, 599; IV. 572; V. 134; VII. 478, 630. Finally, producing 9 instances of *C*'s superiority to *S* as the only ones on which *C*'s advocates lay stress, he tries to show that these readings are due to learned conjecture, five of them demonstrably the fruit of the study of Vergil and Statius. I think the ground is very doubtful here. Valerius was one of Vergil's imitators, and the fact that *C*'s reading recalls Vergil is surely as much for the genuineness as against it. Resemblance to Statius I think a distinct point for genuineness. We know, and K. himself admits on p. lxxi, that Statius did use Valerius: I feel very sceptical as to the probability of a fifteenth-century editor's using Statius. K. himself finds only one instance of 'Statius-interpolation' among *C*'s good readings, and I don't think that even in this the resemblance to Statius, which consists in the juxtaposition by means of double *que* of the words *pontus* and *polus* at the end of the line, is strong enough to serve as foundation of any kind of theory. In the four instances un-

¹ E.g. I. 59 *cantis* (Lochbach), 68 *curvus et quos . . . creditur* (Baehrens), II. 111 *his* (Baehrens), 431 *crescit* (Hosius: how can *transit* be used of an island on which the heroes land?), 464 *fletus* (reading of *S*), III. 193 *hinc* (Langen), 223 *aestus, animos, actus, flatus* (various scholars), 273 transposition of the line to follow 310 (Hartel), 513 *pulso* (Columbus), 540 *moueret* (Pius).

² I cannot however accept his reconstruction of the line: 'dat dextram blandisque pauens Venus oscula miscet (adloquii)'; all that K. urges on behalf of *pauens* on p. lxxvi is useless: Venus is not afraid until l. 394 'iamque tremens longe acquirit Venus.'

earthed from C's bad readings the resemblance to Statius seem to me absolutely accidental. There remains only the consideration of an excellent¹ line with which C fills an indisputable gap of V's in the simile of IV. 195 sqq. K. thinks it is concocted from a line in an almost identical simile found in Statius (*Theb.* VII. 436 sqq.). I must say that in view of the fact that Statius' use of Valerius is certain I think there can be little doubt that we have an example of it in his employ-

¹ K. attacks the line on its merits, but I do not find the *collocatio* particularly *dura*, and decidedly think the language more forcible than that of the line he himself has composed in its stead.

ment of this simile, and it would seem more natural to explain that somehow or other C has really preserved the line of Valerius which inspired l. 439 in Statius. Not that I reject K.'s general attitude towards C: there is no denying that its good readings help us but little: we feel that we could have guessed most of them for ourselves, and any tender feelings they may have excited are choked by the suspicions which the bad ones arouse. But it is no use to close our eyes to certain difficulties about the position, which Kramer cannot be said to have removed.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

Sheffield.

SHORT NOTICES

GREEK ART AND NATIONAL LIFE.

Greek Art and National Life. By S. C. KAINES SMITH. 9" x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xiv + 376, with seven photogravures and many other illustrations. London: Nisbet and Co., 1913. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

MANY will be grateful to Mr. Smith for this enthusiastic account of Greek art and life; others will wish for less of his rather tiring enthusiasm and more opportunity for quiet contemplation of the Greek things themselves. It must, in justice, be admitted that in his preface Mr. Smith claims to be only a 'missionary' and not a 'theologian' in Greek things. Our quarrel with him is that he is too good for this. We should like to have seen him leave to his Extension lectures his rhetorical descriptions of the Sack of Knossos (he seems to know all about it!), of the arrival of Pheidipides with the news of the victory of Marathon, of the battle of Salamis and of the Panathenaic festival, and confine himself to the development of the theme, implied in the title, of a parallelism between the course of history and that of Greek sculpture. It is a good theme well traced out, in spite of occasional

crudities in some of the isolated examples given. Perhaps Mr. Smith will some day give us a more scholarly book—a task of which he is well capable—on these lines, when he will, of course, not omit to give references to the literary authorities—an omission which is rather to be regretted even in a popular work.

Even when we take Mr. Smith at his own valuation we are inclined to think that he writes down to his audience a little too much. Surely even a popular audience can be induced to take an interest in that well-known series of draped Acropolis figures without having them referred to as 'the Aunts'? Otherwise the book is distinctly good; the illustrations are excellent—to say nothing of the seven photogravures. There are some very good conceptions well worked out, as in the interpretation of the labours of Heracles as the work of a new and energetic people, and in the account of the *raison d'être* of the different members of a regular Doric temple. Throughout the book the simple *ὄτι* is traced down to its *δι' ὄτι* whenever possible in natural laws. But occasionally Mr. Smith's desire to work out a pre-conception leads him astray, as when he inclines to accept Paionios and Alkamenes, on the authority of

Pausanias, as the sculptors of the pediments of the Temple of Zeus at Olympia in face of the great discrepancy between that work and what we otherwise know of these sculptors, simply because 'Paionios came from a land of painters' and paint was obviously relied upon in these pediments!

We note two misprints—Plontos on p. xiii and γανῶσις for γάνωσις on p. 181.

R. B. APPLETON.

Lyndesode House, Cambridge.

Aristarchus of Samos. By Sir T. L. HEATH, K.C.B., F.R.S. pp. vi. 425. Clarendon Press, 1913. 18s.

ARISTARCHUS of Samos was an astronomer and mathematician, who may be dated approximately 310-230 B.C. The only work of his now extant is a little treatise on the *Sizes and Distances of the Sun and Moon*, which appears to have been written early in his career, for it is founded on false hypotheses, which he seems to have afterwards corrected. It consists of eighteen propositions, treated in the Euclidean manner, though a figure is not always necessary. *Prop.* 9 is a fair specimen: 'The diameter (*i.e.* the real diameter) of the sun is greater than eighteen times, but less than twenty times, the diameter of the moon.' Sir Thomas Heath has edited the Greek text, translated it and furnished it with notes in the magnificent style with which his editions of Archimedes, Diophantus and other Greek mathematicians have now made us familiar. He does not, however, pretend that this treatise of Aristarchus, though interesting to the mathematician, is of any astronomical importance, since, as above stated, it is founded on two false postulates, *viz.*: that the apparent (not the real) diameters of the sun and moon are always the same with themselves and with one another, and that the apparent diameter of the moon is 2° , a very gross exaggeration. (Archimedes, at a later date, attributes to Aristarchus the discovery that the apparent diameter of the moon is only

$\frac{1}{2}^\circ$.) But though the treatise is not important, Aristarchus is, for he appears to have been the first propounder of the heliocentric theory of the universe, now attributed to Copernicus. This is the matter which chiefly interests Sir Thomas Heath, and has caused him to investigate the whole history of Greek astronomy down to Aristarchus' time. Two-thirds of the book are occupied with this history, and of these two-thirds, a very large portion is devoted to Plato (56 pp.) and Aristotle (32 pp.) Students of the *Timaeus* and the *De Caelo* must not miss our author's careful and original discussion of the various theories and fancies put forward in these works, and of the explanations of them given by the commentators. On the whole, neither Plato nor Aristotle appears to have made any valuable contribution to astronomical science. The salient points in the history of astronomical theory before Hipparchus are that the Pythagoreans, or Pythagoras himself, discovered that the earth was spherical, and suggested that it revolved round a central fire (not the sun): that Heracleides Ponticus, about 350 B.C., discovered that Venus and Mercury revolved round the sun, and that the earth rotates on its axis, and that Aristarchus suggested that the earth and other planets revolved round the sun (of course in *circular* orbits). The rest of the history is a maze of guesses and isolated observations leading up to, or away from, these bits of solid knowledge. To the student of Greek literature, other than philosophical, Sir T. Heath has not much to say. The astronomy of the farmer and the sailor and the *ἱερομνήμων*, which is also the astronomy of the poet and the historian, is not his topic, and he alludes to it only incidentally. He is concerned with theories of the universe, and of these, within his period, he has given by far the fullest account that has yet appeared in any language. The book is not easy reading, but it is at least as easy as it can be made, and there is some stimulus to the energies in the thought that this is the recreation of a man who, in his working hours, is engaged in great affairs.

J. Gow.

Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque.

Par A. MEILLET. Paris: Hachette et Cie., 1913. Cm. 19×12. 1 vol. Pp. xvi+368. Fr. 3.50.

THE work of many scholars carried out during the last thirty years has enabled us to appreciate the development which Greek has made through a long period of time, almost, one might say, from the days of Indo-germanic unity to the present day. This seems somewhat of an exaggeration—for we have no monuments of Greek before the Homeric poems, and there is a great gap in our knowledge of the spoken language between the days of the Byzantine Empire and to-day; but the main lines of development are well established from comparison with other Indo-germanic languages, from the monuments, and from our knowledge of the principles of language in general. M. Meillet's object has been to show, by means of a striking example, how complex has been the development of the Indo-germanic languages, and how greatly outside forces affect the evolution of speech.

The great contribution of the new French school of philologists has been to keep us vividly in touch with the realities of language; and M. Meillet, as the foremost representative of this school, has in this book brilliantly maintained its reputation. In it he shows how the development of Greek has depended on historical events and on social conditions; and how the forces of disintegration and of unification have been at work throughout the whole history of the language.

The book is divided into three sections. The first of these deals with the affinities of Greek to the other Indo-germanic languages, and its subsequent separation into dialect groups. The chapters which treat of the dialects are particularly illuminating, written as they are with all the author's well-known lucidity of thought and expression. In the second section he describes the growth of literary languages, dealing at some length with the languages of the epic, of the lyric, of tragedy, of the Ionic and Attic prose-writers, and of the comedy. This is undoubtedly the most

original contribution of the book, when considered apart from the originality of the main idea. In the last section the author describes the unification of Greek into the *κοινή*, with its origin and characteristics, and its subsequent splitting a second time into local dialects; and he ends with a short account of the growth of a new *κοινή* fostered in the schools, the scientific books, and above all in the newspapers of modern Athens.

This is a work which should be read by all who are interested in Greek, whether or not they are professed students of Comparative Philology. As so often with French books, it is well printed on bad paper (on the other hand it is very cheap); and it contains no index. At the beginning there is a full and well-chosen bibliography.

R. L. TURNER.

Dikaionmata: Auszüge aus Alexandrinischen Gesetzen und Verordnungen in einem Papyrus des philologischen Seminars der Universität Halle, von der Graeca Halensis. 4to. Pp. x+252; 9 plates. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913.

OF the multifarious non-literary documents recovered in recent years from Egypt few approach in interest and importance the papyrus which provides the title of the volume lately issued by the Greek Society of Halle. This remarkable text, which extends to eleven columns, for the most part sufficiently well preserved for satisfactory reconstruction, was written in the middle of the third century B.C., and contains a series of Alexandrian laws and ordinances upon a variety of subjects—testimony, personal violence, taking of oaths, observance of boundaries, purchase of real property, mortgage, and the like. The miscellaneous character of these regulations is plausibly explained by the editors' suggestion that they were put together in some advocate's office for professional use in the courts. In any case they offer material of great value for the student of Greek law and procedure. One noteworthy feature is their individuality. In the third century B.C., especially in a new

foundation like Alexandria, a much closer correspondence with Athenian institutions might naturally have been expected than what is actually found here. Appended to this are a few other Halle papyri, literary and documentary, the chief among the former being a fragment giving the ends of eleven lines which are attributed with much probability to Sappho. The editors have strangely failed to understand the diacritical signs accompanying this text, which are, as usual, marks of quantity, elision, accent, etc., and have nothing to do with musical notation. There are, further, a mutilated epic fragment in which a reference occurs to Hesiod, a scrap of Homer μ , of the (earlier?) Ptolemaic period, showing a divergence from the vulgate at l. 346, some fragments of Aeschines *c. Timarchum*, possessing some critical significance, and other minor pieces. Of the documents, which are all of the third century B.C., not more than two or three are in fair preservation, and these are of comparatively small compass. The volume is admirably produced (Wilcken, though no longer at Halle, is among the editors), and is provided with nine excellent facsimiles and full indices.

A. S. H.

Papyrus de Magdola. Seconde Édition. Par J. LESQUIER. (Papyrus grecs de Lille. Tome II., fasc. ii-iv.) Paris: Leroux, 1912.

THIS is a welcome re-edition of an interesting group of petitions dating from the close of the third century B.C., first published by MM. Jouguet and Lefebvre in the *Bulletin de Correspondence hellénique* in 1902-3. Since then a number of contributions towards the emendation and interpretation of the documents have been made by various scholars, especially by Wilcken, who paid a short visit to Lille in 1904. In the present handsome volume, which includes translations, commentaries and indices, and is accompanied by an envelope of facsimiles, M. Lesquier embodies the results of recent criticism and makes further improvements of his own. It was unfortunate that he failed to observe what is now pointed out

by E. von Druffel in *Philologus* lxxi., pp. 272 ff., that nos. 6 and 38 are parts of the same document.

A. S. H.

Marius the Epicurean, by WALTER PATER, 2 vols. London: Philip Lee Warner, publishers to the Medici Society, 1913. 30s. net.

THIS is the first English book in Medici type which I have handled: I read a good part of it through to get the impression of the type for English, and it proves to be thoroughly legible, and restful to the eye. This is to my mind the most important virtue in type, although designers of modern 'art-types,' including William Morris, seem to be of a very different opinion, and to regard the page as a kind of wall paper with a pattern upon it. Having satisfied myself that this type is legible, I can now examine its shape. Here two points call for remark. The dash is hardly longer than a hyphen—which cannot be thought wise; and the Greek type used for quotations is both ugly and illegible. Yet what a Greek type might be made! Apart from these points, the printing must be admitted to be a real success.

W. H. D. R.

A CATALOGUE OF THE SCULPTURES OF THE MUSEO CAPITOLINO.

A Catalogue of the Sculptures of the Musco Capitolino. By Members of the British School at Rome. Edited by H. STUART JONES, M.A. 1 Vol. and Portfolio of Plates. Text 8vo., Plates 4to. Pp. v+418, 93 Plates. Oxford: Clarendon Press, November 21, 1912. £3 3s.

DR. AMELUNG'S catalogue of the Vatican sculptures may be said to have begun a new era in the cataloguing of antiques. Not only did the descriptions and comments give the maximum of information in the minimum of space, but the complete series of plates made it altogether more useful than any catalogue that had up to that time appeared. To the young student, whose knowledge of bibliography is not extensive, it is

of inestimable use to have a compact series of illustrations, which, together with the text, will in many cases set him on the right track of things, which otherwise he would have found only with difficulty; and the book is of no less use to the researcher whose means of making comparisons and quickly verifying points will be rendered very much more easy.

The present volumes were suggested by Dr. Amelung's work and carry it forward. They are the first instalment of a complete catalogue of the sculptures preserved in the municipal collections at Rome. Mr. Stuart Jones, while Director of the British School at Rome, projected the scheme and obtained the sanction of the authorities. The work was undertaken by the British School as a whole, and the chief contributors are Professor P. Gardner, Mr. Wace, Mr. Yeames, Mr. and Mrs. Daniel, and Mrs. Strong. Dr. Ashby helped with questions of *provenance*, while the Editor, besides supervising and revising the whole, described the Greek portraits.

The present catalogue fully maintains the high standard set by Dr. Amelung. The descriptions of the individual pieces of sculpture are detailed enough to be interesting, but stop short of lengthiness. The chief theories held about the better known works are stated sufficiently but succinctly, while references to replicas and parallels will be found most helpful. Expert opinion has made the statements as to the variety of marble used particularly trustworthy. A test of the thoroughness of the work is to be had in the way in which questions of *provenance* have been gone into. This work, which is always of a laborious description, was rendered particularly so by the absence of any official inventory of the Capitoline Collection. The introduction gives a history of the various phases of the collection, while there are appended to the catalogue such inventories of parts of the collection—notably of the Albani Collection—as are extant. The plates, which are collotypes and show reproductions of every work of our catalogue, are exceedingly clear and compare favourably with those of the Vatican cata-

logue. In testing some of the references only one slip was found. The two catalogues which are to complete the plan undertaken by the British School at Rome are to be those of the Palazzo dei Conservatori and of the Magazzino Archeologico on the Caelian. All archaeologists owe a great debt of gratitude to Mr. Stuart Jones and his colleagues for the work they have done.

It is to be hoped that in the future it will become the rule instead of being the exception for museums to be catalogued in the way in which the Vatican has been catalogued, and the Municipal Collections at Rome and the vases in the Munich Antiquarium are in process of being catalogued.

E. M. W. T.

The Cults of Ostia. By LILY ROSS TAYLOR. (Bryn Mawr College Monographs, Vol. XI.). Bryn Mawr, Pa.: published by Bryn Mawr College, 1912. 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. 98. \$1.00 net.

MISS TAYLOR'S monograph is an extremely careful and thorough piece of work, and the religious history of Ostia presents so many points of interest that the collection of the evidence for its various cults was worth the trouble taken. The earliest and perhaps, from an official point of view, the most important of these worships was that of Volcanus, in connexion with which we meet with the remarkable titles of *pontifex Volcani et aedium sacrarum, praetor and aedilissacris Volcani faciundis*. Wissowa's view that the god of fire was worshipped at Ostia on account of the dangers to which its granaries were exposed, has little to commend it, since the cult dates from a period when Rome had not learnt to depend on foreign corn; and we can only suppose that from remote antiquity Volcanus had been to Ostia what Diana was to Aricia or Juno Sospita to Lanuvium. Miss Taylor suggests that the worship of the fire-god belonged to a village which was merged in the Roman colony of Ostia, founded—as recent inquiry and the negative results of excavation seem to show—about the end of the fourth or beginning

of the third century B.C. This does not seem likely, as if such a *pagus* or *vicus* existed, it was not on the site of the colony, nor is *practor* a title for which parallels can be found.

It is well known that Ostia has furnished abundant evidence of the spread of Oriental cults in the West during the first three centuries of the Empire, and especially of Mithraism. Miss Taylor notes that as compared with Puteoli the worship of Syrian and Phoenician gods was relatively uncommon at Ostia, while the cults of Magna Mater and Mithras, which flourished there, were probably not directly introduced from the East. The conclusion that the presence of foreign traders is not reflected in the religious institutions of Ostia is not, however, to be pressed. The prevalence of Isis-worship, and more especially the presence of a *Sara-phœum* at Portus, points to a close connexion with Alexandria.

By a curious slip '44 B.C.' is twice printed for '44 A.D.' on p. 14.

H. STUART JONES.

The Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome. By SAMUEL BALL PLATNER, Western Reserve University. 2nd edition, revised and enlarged. 8 maps and plans, 93 illustrations in text. Svo. 1 vol. Pp. xiv+538. Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1911. \$3.

ALTHOUGH somewhat belated, this notice may serve to draw the attention of some who are in search of a handy manual of Roman topography to the revised edition of Mr. S. B. Platner's book, which follows the original issue after an interval of seven years, during which excavations in Rome, though not so startling in their results as those of the preceding period, have brought to light some important remains, whilst the study of those previously discovered has made continuous and fruitful progress. The scope of Mr. Platner's work prevents him from giving a full discussion of the very difficult problems which have been raised in recent years—such, for example, as those which concern the position of the temple of Apollo on the Palatine, or the various transformations of the Rostra; but the reader may be

sure of finding the opposing views which contend for the acceptance of archaeologists fairly stated, and—what is equally important—accompanied by bibliographical references, which will enable him to go to the original sources if he wishes to make a more profound study. Mr. Platner prides himself justly on the great increase in the number of references supplied in the new edition; they form perhaps the most valuable element in this as compared with other works of the same kind. Mr. Platner has of course made the fullest use of Huelsen's volume issued in continuation of Jordan's *Topographie der Stadt Rom*, and it would be hard to point to any matter of importance in which he has failed to incorporate its suggestions; there can be little doubt, however, that the name *Amphitheatrum Castrense* signifies 'Court Amphitheatre,' as Huelsen explains it (cf. Hirschfeld, *Verwaltungsbeamten*, p. 313, note 3), though Mr. Platner (p. 471, note 2) does not seem to regard the idea with favour. We should have expected a more definite statement of the objections which have been raised by Carter and others to the traditional primacy of the Palatine settlement; the more so as Mr. Platner is generally inclined to give a favourable hearing to new views, such as those of Pinza on the location of the temple of Apollo. The short paragraph on p. 44 f. hardly does justice to the theory in question; and the conclusion, 'while there is much to be said in support of this view, it still seems on the whole less probable than the other,' is cautious but slightly unsatisfying. Nevertheless Mr. Platner's book may be heartily commended as the best manual of its kind; and it deserves to command a wide sale amongst those who are interested in the topography of ancient Rome.

H. STUART JONES.

Glanymor, Sandersfoot, Pembrokeshire.

Life and Letters in Roman Africa. By E. S. BOUCHIER, M.A. Small Svo. 1 vol. Pp. 128. Oxford: R. H. Blackwell, 1913. 3s. 6d.

THIS is a pleasantly written and easily read essay, which may be useful in con-

veying some idea of Roman civilisation in Africa to readers who are unlikely to consult larger works, or works in languages other than English. The subject is of course so extensive that the picture almost inevitably tends, more on account of the scale than of the treatment, to become somewhat shadowy. The vast achievement of the Romans in promoting agriculture, for example, in their North African possessions, whereby regions which were arid under Carthaginian rule, became fruitful, can hardly be grasped from Mr. Bouchier's handling. Indeed there are phrases on p. 17 which may incline the reader to believe that agriculture decayed under the Romans.

In detail, the book presents a good many blemishes which might easily have been removed by careful revision and verification of the evidence. There is given on p. 14 a description of Carthage between the time of C. Gracchus and that of Caesar, which is entirely misconceived. To mention only one point, it is stated that the Carthaginians made offers during that period to the enemies of Rome, and we are referred to Athenaeus v. 50. That passage consists of rhetorical rant placed in the mouth of the demagogue Athenio, who brought over Athens to the side of Mithridates. He represents all the world as hurrying to the support of the cause, and talks of an embassy from Carthage! The mention on p. 76 of 'the tyrant Tetricus in 265 on his elevation to the throne of Africa' is an error. A quotation is given from the *Historia Augusta*, which refers to Cel-sus, the usurper, who tried to supplant Gallienus, and after seven days was killed and his body eaten by dogs. Of course Tetricus ruled Gaul and Spain for a considerable period. On p. 78 we read of 'priestesses, mostly widows,' who served Ceres-Tanit. The two quotations from Tertullian which are given show that these 'viduae' were women who had deserted their husbands for the sake of the goddess, and were devotees, not priestesses. Some references are wrongly given. In a note on p. 74 'Tert. *Apol.* xv.' should be ix.; and on p. 76 'Ulp. *Fragm.* 226' should be xxii. 6.

Sometimes when Mr. Bouchier repeats opinions widely current, a consideration of the evidence by which they are supported would have suggested doubts. A study of Tertullian's words in *Pall.* I. makes it difficult to understand 'soror civitas' of Rome (p. 15). The authorities do not support very well some statements about human sacrifice on p. 74, in which, for one thing, different ages are not distinguished. Thus Diod. xx. 14. 6 bears on the time of Agathocles. And it is hard to suppose that Tertullian in *Apol.* ix. would speak of the reign of Tiberius as his 'proconsulate' or of the emperor himself as 'proconsul' of Africa. And the reference to Plin. *N. H.* 36, 5 is a puzzle which I cannot solve.

J. S. R.

The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century, with a Revised Text of the Kletorologion of Philotheos. By J. B. BURY. Large 8vo. Pp. 180. London: Published for the British Academy by Henry Frowde, 1911. 2s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR BURY has produced a work of amazing erudition, which will be welcome to the political and economic historian of the Eastern Empire as well as to those interested in the elaborate Palace organisation of the period. He rightly saw that it was no longer possible to work on the old text of Philotheos in Bekker's Bonn edition of the Byzantine historians, and he has formed a new and vastly superior text, using photographs of the Leipzig MS. (much the best for the whole work) as well as the latest labours of Russian workers on the subject: he has wisely made the work far more convenient for reference by restoring in to its original tabular form.

Of the general conclusions which he draws from Philotheos, using also his wide knowledge of the other documents which throw light upon the period, there is not room here to speak at any length: it must suffice to say that the exposition is both masterly and lucid, and that no work on the administration of the Empire at this time will in future

be able to appear which is not based on this study. He adds a valuable and apparently complete bibliography of the subject, which shows only too clearly that historians of the Empire at this stage will fare very badly without a knowledge of Russian. On p. 10 the word *collection* seems a mis-print for *collation*, or else *MS.* should be *MSS.* G.

NUMISMATIQUE CONSTANTIN- IENNE.

Numismatique Constantinienne. Par JULES MAURICE. Tome III. Pp. xlviii+286. 8vo, with 11 collotype plates and 4 tables. Paris: Leroux, 1912. Fr. 15.

WITH this volume, containing the four eastern mints, Nicomedia, Cyzicus, Antioch and Alexandria, M. Maurice completes the description of the coinage of the Constantinian period. The four sections dealing with the mints follow the lines with which we are familiar from the earlier volumes, and it is therefore unnecessary to characterise them. An introduction deals with two points; one, the denominations of the bronze coinage from Diocletian to Constantine, will eventually be handled more fully in the general introduction which the author promises as a supplement, and is of purely numismatic interest. But the other question, the influence of the persecution of Maximinus Daza on the coinage, is of more general importance. In the course of his discussion, M. Maurice shows that the altar which appears on the coins struck in the mints of Maximinus is the expression of the obligation laid upon all subjects of the Emperors to sacrifice to the gods, including the Emperor himself. He also shows how the coins illustrate the great importance attached by Maximinus to the cults of the Egyptian gods and of the Sun, and how Egypt exerted its influence, both under Maximinus and Julian, on the organisation of the pagan hierarchy. This introduction cannot well be neglected by students of early Christian history. We look forward eagerly to the supplementary volume which, with

indexes and appendixes, will make M. Maurice's invaluable work complete. G. F. H.

Papyrus Graecus Holmiensis, Recepte für Silber, Steine und Purpur. VON O. LAGERCRANTZ. Upsala, 1913. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. 248. 2 Plates.

THE long and well-preserved papyrus here edited has had a singular history. Presented in 1832 to the Swedish Academy of Antiquities by Johann d'Anastasy, then consul for Sweden and Norway at Alexandria, it lay unheeded and forgotten in the National Museum of Stockholm until 1906, when it was transferred to Upsala. Ample justice for past neglect has now been done by the painstaking publication of O. Lagercrantz, who is inclined to err on the side of over-elaboration. The MS. is a single quire of seven tall sheets, written, to judge from the two specimen facsimiles, in the fourth century, and containing a series of chemical formulae for the fabrication of silver, precious stones, and dyes of various kinds. It is nearly related to a Leyden text (X) published in 1885 by Leemanns, which, like the rest of the Leyden group of papyri, was also obtained from d'Anastasy. P. Leyden X is similar both in date and contents, not a few of its formulae recurring in the Stockholm papyrus. Those for precious stones, however, are absent in the former, which on the other hand has a section on gold not represented in the latter. The two papyri thus supplement each other, both apparently being descendants of the Pseudo-Democritean *Φυσικά*, which were also the ultimate source of numerous excerpts in the later Alchemists. In the history of this branch of literature the new text is thus a factor of considerable value.

A. S. H.

Aegean Days. By J. IRVING MANATT. With Illustrations. Murray, 1913.

THIS book made one reader homesick. It brought back to his memory many happy days spent in the isles of Greece,

but one cannot say much more than that. There is very little new observation in it, and its object is not to teach archaeology; it is meant to give pleasure, and it does give pleasure. But not pleasure unalloyed; for there is a great deal of repetition, both stories and phrases coming in over again, which matters little in ephemeral papers but does matter in a book. Even papers on the same subject are not put together; we hop from Andros to Paros and elsewhere, and then back to Andros again. The style also is full of commonplace tags, and has a few American phrases which are not pleasing, nor is the sentimental touch; 'poor Helen' hardly sums up her story, and 'poor Ajax' is the last thing one would say of Ajax.

The account of Naxos is perhaps the best paper in the book, for the remarkable tower of Andros has been described before; but there are several good descriptions, such as the community of monks in Andros, the wise woman, the trampling of roofs (why, O why, did not Mr. Manatt give us the song they sing as they make the roofs?); and there is a vampire story and one piece of observation which I shall quote (p. 176). As they descended from the

heights of Andros, 'the sun was just enough clouded to produce the peculiar effect, familiar to the Homeric poet . . . of the "wine-faced deep." Except immediately inshore, where the colour was a vivid green, the whole sea was a flood of rich red wine—no eye could mistake it, no one could give it any other description. This continued for half an hour, when dense rain-clouds gathered on Kouvári, and the sea darkened into purple.' But Homer becomes a Lesbian (p. 280), and Mr. Manatt is quite bewitched by Dörpfeld; although he 'reserves his judgment,' he clearly inclined to accept all the airy hypothesis which un-Ithacas Ithaca, and 'establishes the poet's highest claims as a geographer' (p. 387). Homer doubtless did not willingly deceive us in geography, but his object was, I imagine, rather to be a poet.

These remarks may convey a wrong impression. The book raised expectations from its size and magnificence, which it does not quite fulfil; but it is written with genuine pleasure, and it gives pleasure to read, which would have been even greater if it had been pruned of what is trivial or repeated.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—In 'Etymologies and Derivations' (*Classical Quarterly*, January, 1914) Mr. E. W. Fay speaks of *gurges* as meaning 'eddy' (p. 57).

I think it is difficult to establish this meaning. *Gurges* is used by Livy merely as the opposite to *vadum*, and I think it only means something in which you can be swallowed up, not something that goes round and round. In other words, it is a synonym for *vorago* (and thus it is used by Cicero), and not for *vertex*.

This view is in no way adverse to Mr. Fay's explanation of the meaning and derivation of the word; indeed, it rather helps it than otherwise.

I am, sir,
Yours faithfully,
M. T. TATHAM.

Northcourt House, Abingdon.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

DEAR SIR,—I beg a few lines of your space in order to advertise among scholars a project for a *Lexicon Terentianum*, on which Mr. Patrick M'Glynn, George Clark Fellow in the University of Glasgow, is now engaging. The utility of some more exact and complete analysis of Terence's language than the Delphin and Lemaire indices needs no emphasizing. Mr. M'Glynn is planning his work on the model of Merguet's *Vergil-Lexicon*, giving contexts.

As the undertaking is laborious and lengthy, it would be deplorable if, for want of announcement made betimes, anybody else should set about the same. This notice is intended to avert the risk of duplication.

Yours faithfully,
J. S. PHILLIMORE.

5, The College, Glasgow, December 6, 1913.

VERSION

'Oh, silver girl! oh, silver girl! have pity now,' I cried,
 'Long years I knew my mother earth and knew no thing beside;
 Now you have called me from my peace to kill me with disdain,
 Give me a kiss, or let me be Mad Harry yet again.
 I cannot hear your blessed hymn, because your body cries
 A louder, sweeter song, that takes my spirit by surprise;
 Sin should not wear so fine a dress, and I would have you know
 It is not fair of God to tempt a poor old sinner so.'

The silver girl thought east and west, she wondered north and south,
 And there was laughter in her eyes and in her lovely mouth;
 She stood a-plucking at her dress and nodding of her head,
 'It seems to me I've taught this damned old fool too much,' she said.

R. MIDDLETON.

'O nostri miserere, nympha,' dixi,
 'O argentea nympha, nam per annos terram matrem ego noueram, nec ultra quidquam; cum tamen e quiete motum me fastuque odioque perdidisti, da mi basia, da, precor, trecenta, aut da sim Lycidas, ut ante, Demens. Non sanctam bibere aure cantilenam possum, corpus enim tuum uenustum sonat splendidius quid et canorum, inuaditque meam repente mentem; non in ueste ita conuenit nitente peccatrix spatietur ut per urbem, et te scire uelim Jouem esse iniquum qui tantum alliciat senem misellum.'

Versat cuncta animo modo huc, modo illuc,
 admirata puella susque deque, subridens oculis et ore pulcro; tum uellens tunicam, caputque quasans,
 respondit, 'satis ah! satis superque insulsum hunc docui senem, ut uideatur.'

R. C. S.

OBITUARY

ANOTHER great German Latinist has gone from us, the Göttingen Professor, Friedrich Leo. It is hard to realise that he has gone. Only a few months ago I got a bright, kindly letter from him about an edition of Festus. And certainly the brilliant first volume, just published, of his *History of Roman Literature* gave not the slightest indication of any weakening of bodily or mental power. Yet he had accomplished in his lifetime the work of ten men—editions of Virgil's *Culex*, of Seneca's *Tragedies*, of Venantius Fortunatus, of Plautus, of Juvenal, and Persius, contributions to an edition of the fragments of the early tragedians, an exhaustive treatment of Plautine Metre, of Saturnian Verse, of the whole history of Roman Comedy (for his *Plautinische Forschungen* has no narrower a

range), of monologue in the Greek and Latin drama. These are merely the chief items on the list. The full list of his writings would fill several pages. And to all this we must add his wonderful work as professor at Göttingen, as joint-editor of *Hermes*, as a director of the *Thesaurus*. Mommsen may have achieved more, but (in his generation at least) only Mommsen.

Of all that Leo did, probably the greatest thing was his work on Plautus. It must have been the performance which brought him most gratification. For, after long endurance of unfriendly criticism, due to a too hasty attempt on this author, he lived to see his final and matured treatment of the text command universal respect. His years of fighting ended in a great triumph. But I have sometimes

thought that they were the cause of that tendency to pessimism which seemed now and then to lead him astray in his investigations, and, if this be not an ungracious remark, of a slight unwillingness to make concessions to adverse criticism. For any German professor, and above all for one enthroned as Leo was in his Göttingen professorship, to yield to criticism must be a far harder task than we in England find it. Freytag's novel, *Die Verlorene Handschrift*, shows us a state of things which we here can hardly realise, the students of the Seminar identifying themselves with their professor's researches, glorying in his successes and mortified by his failures. Loyalty to such 'Commilitonen' must prevent him from hauling down the flag until the very last moment.

If Leo's work on Plautus had a

weak side, the cause lay in his want of sympathy with Comparative Philology. His studies in this field had never, I fancy, gone beyond Buecheler's *Altlateinische Deklination* and Ritschl's *Prolegomena*. Where he excelled was in his knowledge of the Greek Drama and of the conditions under which the Greek and Roman plays were edited by ancient scholars. Here he owed much to his colleague, Professor von Wilamowitz-Moellendorff. The conjunction of these two bright constellations was indeed a happy omen for Plautine study. It is sad to think that the *Geschichte der römischen Litteratur* has been left unfinished; but how thankful we must be for all that he had lived to achieve!

W. M. LINDSAY.

The University of St. Andrews.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

* * * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

American Journal of Philology. Edited by B. L. Gildersleeve. Vol. XXXIV. 4. Pp. 381-514. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1914.

Bardt (C.) Römische Charakterköpfe in Briefen. 9" × 6". Pp. xviii + 434. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 9.

Baring-Gould (S.) A Book of Folk Lore (The Nation's Library). 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " × 4 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 264. London: Collins' Clear Type Press. Cloth, 1s. net.

Besnier (M.) Lexique de Géographie Ancienne. 7" × 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xx + 893. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1914. Cloth, Fr. 10.

Birt (T.) Kritik und Hermeneutik nebst Abriss des antiken Buchwesens. 10" × 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii + 395. München: O. Beck, 1913. M. 7.50.

Cagnat (R.) Cours d'Épigraphie Latine (4^{me} édition, revue et augmentée; avec 28 planches hors texte). 10" × 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xxviii + 504. Paris: Fontemoing et Cie., 1914.

Classical Association; Bombay Branch. Proceedings, 1912-13. With Rules and List of Members. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " × 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 82. Rs. 1.8 net.

Classical Philology: A Quarterly Journal devoted to Research in the Languages, Literature, History, and Life of Classical Antiquity. Vol. IX., No. 1. January,

1914. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " × 6 $\frac{5}{8}$ ". Pp. viii + 1-112. University of Chicago Press.

Diels (A.) La Transposition Platonicienne. 10" × 7". Pp. 44. Louvain: Institut Supérieur de Philosophie, 1913. Le Socrate de Platon. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " × 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 412-434. Kain (Belgique): Le Saulchoir, 1913. Note sur l'Ἑλένης Ἐγκώμιον de Gorgias. 10" × 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 192-208. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1913. Revue Critique d'Histoire de la Philosophie Antique. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " × 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 1-32. Paris: M. Rivière, 1913.

Draheim (H.) Die Lieder des Horaz, lateinisch und deutsch in Auswahl. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " × 5". Pp. 228. Berlin: G. Grote, 1913. Paper boards, M. 4.

Ferguson (W. D.) The Legal Terms Common to the Macedonian Inscriptions and the New Testament. 10" × 7". Pp. 110. Chicago Press, Illinois; and Cambridge: University Press, 1913. 3s. net.

Haeverfield (F.) Ancient Town Planning. 9" × 6". Pp. 152. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. Paper boards, 6s. net.

Heisenberg (A.) and Wenger (L.) Veröffentlichungen aus der Papyrus-Sammlung der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek zu München 1 Byzantinische Papyri, Mit xxxvii. Tafeln in Lichtdruck. Text, 12" × 9", pp. x + 203; photographs, 22 $\frac{1}{2}$ " × 16 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 28.

- Hirschfeld* (O.) *Kleine Schriften*. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. x+1012. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 30.
- Homer*. *Der Dichter und seine Welt* (Erster Teil) von Georg Finsler. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xvi+460. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 5.
- Homericische Aufsätze*. Von Dr. Adolph Roemer. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. vi+216. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 8.
- Klassiker der Archäologie*. Band III., L. Ross, Inselreisen II. Teil, pp. xii+168, M. 3.50. Band IV., F. G. Welcker, Zoega's Leben, II. Teil, pp. iv+261, M. 4. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 6". Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1913.
- Larfeld* (W.) *Griechische Epigraphik*. 10" $\times$ 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii+536, mit 4 Tafeln. München: C. H. Beck, 1914. M. 10.
- Limen* (Teachers' Edition) By Professors Walters and Conway. Being the Fourth Edition of *Limen*, with the addition of Suggestions for Teachers in the Oral Method. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5". Pp. xxiv+375+24. London: John Murray, 1913. Cloth, 3s.
- Majer-Leonhard* (E.) *Ἀγάρμματα qui litteras sciverint qui resciverint ex papyris graecis quantum fieri potest exploratur*. 10" $\times$ 8". Pp. 78. Frankfurt-on-Main: Diekmann, 1913. M. 6.
- Martha* (J.) *La Langue Étrusque*. 10" $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xiv+494. Paris: E. Le Roux, 1913.
- Masqueray* (P.) *Bibliographie Pratique de la Littérature Grecque*. 8" $\times$ 5". Pp. vi+334. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1914. Fr. 5.
- Mensel* (F.) *Edmund Burke und die französische Revolution*. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 6". Pp. viii+150. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 5.
- Monist* (The) *A Quarterly Magazine devoted to the Philosophy of Science*. Vol. XXIV., No. 1. January, 1914. 10" $\times$ 8". Pp. viii+1-160. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company. 2s. 6d.
- More* (P. E.) *The Paradox of Oxford* (Humanistic Papers, Second Series, III.). 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 19. Michigan University Bulletin, June, 1913.
- Moulton* (J. H.) *Early Zoroastrianism* (Hibbert Lectures, Second Series). 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xx+468. London: Williams and Norgate, 1913. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Norden* (E.) *Josephus und Tacitus, über Jesus Christus und eine messianische Prophetie*. 10 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 30. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 1.
- Pankhurst* (C.) *The Great Scourge, and How to End it*. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii+155. London: E. Pankhurst, 1913. Cloth.
- Powers* (H. H.) *The Message of Greek Art*. 8" $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. x+336. London: Macmillan and Co., 1913. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Preussische Jahrbücher* (Delbrück). Band 154, Heft 3. 9" $\times$ 6". Pp. 389-580. Berlin: G. Stilke, 1913. M. 2.50.
- Quiggin* (E. C.) *Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway on his Sixtieth Birthday*. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xxv+656. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Cloth, 25s. net.
- Rabbow* (P.) *Antike Schriften über 'Seelenheilung und Seelenleitung. I. Die Therapie des Zorus*. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. vi+198. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 6.
- Rasi* (P.) *Bibliografia Virgiliana (1910-11)*. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 128. Mantua: G. Mondovi, 1913. L. 10.
- Riese* (A.) *Das Rheinische Germanien in den Antiken Inschriften*. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii+480. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 18.
- Roper* (A. G.) *Ancient Eugenics*. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 5". Pp. iv+74. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1913. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Royds* (T. F.) *The Beasts, Birds, and Bees of Virgil*. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 5". Pp. xviii+108. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1914. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Schissel von Fleschenberg* (O.) *Entwicklungsgeschichte der griechischen Romanen in Altertum*. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. xx+110. Halle: M. Niemeyer, 1913. M. 3.40.
- Sophokles* (Antigone) IV Band, 11te Auflage, besorgt von E. Bruhn. 8" $\times$ 5". Pp. 222. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 2.20.
- Taccone* (A.) *Gli Idilli di Teocrito, tradotti in versi Italiani, con introduzione e note*. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xx+298. Torino: Fr. Bocca, 1914. L. 6.
- Teubner's Texts*. Hesiodi Carmina (Rzach), pp. vi+268, M. 1.50. M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis (Hosius), Libri X., pp. lx+395, M. 4.40. Miracula S. Georgii (Aufhauser), pp. xvi+178, M. 4. P. Cornelii Taciti Libri qui supersunt (Halm), Tomus Prior, pp. iv+382+54, M. 1.50. Olympiodori Philosophi in Platonis Phaedonem Commentaria (Norvin), pp. xi+272, M. 5. Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum (Thulin), Vol. I., Fasc. I., pp. iv+172, M. 7. Apulei Platonici Metamorphoseon (Helm), Libri XI., pp. viii+296, M. 3. Andocidis Orationes (Blass), pp. xxii+124, M. 1.50. Pindari Carmina (Schroeder), pp. xiv+372, M. 2.40. Philodemi de Ira Liber (Wilke), pp. liv+115, M. 3.60. Repertorium Lateinischer Wörterverzeichnisse und Speziallexika (Rowald), pp. 22, M. 0.60. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913.
- Verrall* (A. W.) *Euripides the Rationalist: A Study in the History of Art and Religion*. 9" $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. x+280. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. (Reprint.) Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Weller* (C. H.) *Athens and its Monuments*. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xxiv+412. New York: The Macmillan Co. Cloth, 17s. net.
- Whitehouse* (J. H.) *A National System of Education*. 9" $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii+92. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.
- Winbolt* (S. E.) *Bell's Simplified Latin Classics: The Agricola of Tacitus*, pp. x+92; *Sallust's Catiline*, pp. x+98. 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". London: Geo. Bell and Sons, 1913. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

The Classical Review

MARCH, 1914

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

ARISTOTLE, *PRIOR ANALYTICS*, II. 23.

ALL commentators, both ancient and modern, have felt considerable difficulties both with the text and with the interpretation of this chapter. For the text Pacius proposes as a remedy to read in 68^b 21, πᾶν γὰρ τὸ Γ μακρόβιον instead of the MS. πᾶν γὰρ τὸ ἄχολον μακρόβιον. But my friend, Professor J. A. Smith, has kindly suggested to me that what is wrong is the insertion of the second μακρόβιον in l. 20, where τό καθ' ἕκαστον is predicate, unless indeed this second μακρόβιον is an error for ἄχολον. He would retain πᾶν γὰρ τὸ ἄχολον μακρόβιον in l. 21 as explanatory of τῷ δὴ Γ ὅλῳ ὑπάρχει τὸ Α. Here, however, I wish to make a few suggestions for the better elucidation of the meaning.

In this chapter Aristotle reduces ἐπαγωγή to a syllogistic form, and calls it συλλογισμὸς τῆς πρώτης καὶ ἀμέσου προτάσεως, but at the same time refuses to call it συλλογισμὸς διὰ τοῦ μέσου, defining it as (l. 16) τὸ διὰ τοῦ ἐτέρου (minor term) θάτερον ἄκρον (major term) τῷ μέσῳ συλλογίσασθαι. In fact, he tells us ὃν μὲν ἐστὶ μέσον, διὰ τοῦ μέσου ὁ συλλογισμὸς, ὃν δὲ μὴ ἐστὶ, δι' ἐπαγωγῆς. Furthermore, he tells us that for the reasoning to be valid, δεῖ νοεῖν τὸ Γ τὸ ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν καθ' ἕκαστον συγκείμενον* ἢ γὰρ ἐπαγωγή διὰ πάντων, so that in the minor premise the terms may be simply convertible.

Still, though he thus reduces ἐπαγωγή to syllogistic form, in this very same

chapter he repeatedly opposes ἐπαγωγή to συλλογισμὸς: l. 13, ἅπαντα γὰρ πιστένομεν ἢ διὰ συλλογισμοῦ ἢ ἐξ ἐπαγωγῆς; and l. 33, τρόπον τινὰ ἀντικεῖται ἢ ἐπαγωγῇ τῷ συλλογισμῷ· ὁ μὲν γὰρ διὰ τοῦ μέσου τὸ ἄκρον τῷ τρίτῳ δεικνυσιν, ἢ δὲ διὰ τοῦ τρίτου τὸ ἄκρον τῷ μέσῳ. In almost the same breath, therefore, Aristotle seems to call ἐπαγωγή both syllogism and not syllogism.

It is to be noted also that, though here he calls ἐπαγωγή the συλλογισμὸς τῆς πρώτης καὶ ἀμέσου προτάσεως, the concrete example that he has taken to illustrate the process (major term, long-lived, middle, bileless, minor, individual long-lived animals, or species of them) is taken from the sphere of τὰ φθαρτά, which do not admit of strict ἀπόδειξις, so that no property can be demonstrated to belong to them καθόλου in the full sense of κατὰ παντός, καθ' αὐτό, and ἢ αὐτό. Consequently, his own condition for the validity of the reasoning—ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν καθ' ἕκαστον συγκείμενον—can never be fulfilled in this case.

It seems to me, then, that Aristotle's real meaning amid these apparent contradictions will best be ascertained by comparing this chapter with other passages (a) about discovering πρῶται καὶ ἄμεσοι προτάσεις or ἀρχαί, (b) about proving properties belonging to φθαρτά, (c) about the use of ἐπαγωγή in practice.

(a) In the *Prior Analytics*, I. 30, Aristotle tells us that knowledge of ἀρχαί in the separate sciences, e.g., astronomy,

can only be gained from experience of particular phenomena; and how this intellectual knowledge is to be intuited by νοῦς out of one or more instances presented by αἴσθησις he repeatedly explains in the *Posterior Analytics* (I. 18, 31, 34, II. 2, 13, 19). Hence it appears that αἴσθησις may in one or more instances present us with, e.g., a bronze isosceles triangle. Such particulars, reviewed by ἐπαγωγή, lead the νοῦς to grasp the universal that all triangles are figures contained by three lines. In fact, whenever we generalise, ἴπσο facto we go beyond experience and do so by νοῦς. It is not, then, by accident that Aristotle in this chapter says, νοεῖν τὸ Γ τὸ ἐξ ἀπάντων τῶν καθ' ἕκαστον συγκείμενον. (Cf. *Anal. Post.*, I. 31, τῷ ὁρᾶν μὲν χωρὶς ἐφ' ἑκάστης, νοῆσαι δ' ἅμα ὅτι ἐπὶ πασῶν οὕτως.) He must mean no exhaustive list of instances, whether of individuals or of species, gained *per enumerationem simplicem*, but an intuitive apprehension by νοῦς of the cause—καθόλου or αἴτιον (cf. *Anal. Post.*, I. 31, 88^a 5)—which as such is κατὰ παντός, just as by νοῦς we intuit the conclusion present in two syllogistic premises (cf. *de Motu Anim.*, 7, ὅταν τὰς δύο προτάσεις νοήσῃ, τὸ συμπέρασμα ἐνόησε καὶ συνέθηκεν).

(b) Τὰ φθαρτά (perishables) are part of the subject-matter of Physics: they are οὐσίαι αἰσθηταί, and of οὐσία αἰσθητή one subdivision is eternal, and the other perishable, like plants and animals. The eternal subdivision comprises the εἶδος and its properties, and as such they are νοητά; but, as they are bound up with ὕλη, Physics does not admit of mathematical exactness. Now in *Anal. Post.*, II. 17, 99^b 5, Aristotle happens to recur to his present instance of long-lived, bileless, etc.; only now it appears as an instance of ἀπόδειξις and not of ἐπαγωγή, and that too in a slightly different form. He suggests that in four-footed animals the cause of longevity may be bilelessness, but in birds dryness or what not. Here the problem of ἀπόδειξις is to discover the *vera causa*, and this is done by the faculty of ἀγχίνοια, which is defined (*Anal. Post.*, I. 34) as εὐστοχία τις ἐν ἀσκέπτῳ χρόνῳ τοῦ μέσου. By the review (ἐπαγωγή), then, of certain four-footed animals, e.g., horse, mule, etc., we are led to guess

at the cause of their longevity as bilelessness, which will be the μέσον between the class four-footed animal, and its attribute longevity, and so give us the following syllogism:

Bileless animals are long-lived.
Four-footed animals are bileless.
Four-footed animals are long-lived.

The major premise in this syllogism, where the middle term is the definition of the major term (*Anal. Post.*, II. 17. 99^a 21), is an ἀρχή—not, indeed, ἐξ ἀνάγκης, but only ἐνδεχομένη (*Anal. Post.*, I. 32. 88^b 7)—and as a πρώτη καὶ ἄμεσος πρότασις must have been discovered by ἐπαγωγή. In this case, however, there can have been no exhaustive enumeration of instances, but only sufficient to suggest the assumed καθόλου. In our present chapter, therefore, τὸ ἐξ ἀπάντων καθ' ἕκαστον συγκείμενον must be an ideal only realisable in the mathematical sciences, where κατὰ παντός is not only κατὰ παντός, but implies also καθ' αὐτό, ἢ αὐτό, and καθόλου, the subject-matter being τὰ μὴ ἐνδεχόμενα ἄλλως ἔχειν. In the less exact sciences only generalisation, ὡς ἐπὶ τὸ πολὺ, is possible, though here too Aristotle calls the review of particulars ἐπαγωγή, the faculty of generalisation νοῦς, and the faculty of hitting upon middle terms or causes ἀγχίνοια.

In the above apodeictic syllogism the middle term, as we have seen, gives the *vera causa*, τὸ αἴτιον τὸ μέσον. But in the so-called 'inductive syllogism' of *Anal. Pr.*, II. 23, the minor term—man, horse, mule, etc.—gives only the *causa cognoscendi* of the καθόλου—all bileless animals are long-lived. This doctrine is in strict accordance with that of *Anal. Post.*, I. 13, 78^a 34 (τοῦτο δ' εἰλήφθω δι' ἐπαγωγῆς ἢ δι' αἰσθήσεως), where we are told that such a syllogism gives, not the διότι, but only the ὅτι. This amounts to saying that syllogistically the only conclusion that can be drawn from such an inductive syllogism is that *some* bileless animals are long-lived; but that through νοῦς in cases where by intuition all the essential conditions of the problem have been taken into account, this particular conclusion can be transformed extra-syllogistically into a universal conclusion. It cannot mean that in any and every scien-

tific sphere an exhaustive enumeration of instances must previously be attained. In other words, the ἐξ ἐπαγωγῆς συλλογισμός is an attempt to show diagrammatically—just like Mill's methods of induction—the *causa cognoscendi* of our intuiting (νοεῖν) a *vera causa*.

(c) In practice Aristotle repeatedly uses the term ἐπαγωγή to mean the review of instances—one, few, many, or all—leading to a general statement.

Thus, in *Met. Δ.* 29. 1025^a 10, διὰ τῆς ἐπαγωγῆς he determines the meaning of τὸ ψεῦδος, and in *E. I.* 1025^b 15 shows that the separate sciences do not demonstrate οὐσία or τί ἐστι. Again, ἐπὶ τῶν καθ' ἕκαστα τῇ ἐπαγωγῇ in *Θ.* 6. 1048^a 36 he exhibits the difference between δύναμις and ἐνέργεια, and in *I.* 3. 1054^b 33 the difference between generic and specific differentiae. (Cf. 4. 1055^a 5 and 17, 1058^a 9.) Similarly by ἐπαγωγή in *Anal. Post.*, II. 13. 97^b 7, he obtains a definition of μεγαλοψυχία, and in *Cat.* 8 shows that good is necessarily contrary to evil, in the latter case citing three instances and then adding ὁμοίως δὲ καὶ ἐπὶ τῶν ἄλλων. In *Meteor.* IV. 1 by ἐπαγωγή he shows that hot and cold are productive, dry and moist passive elements (φαίνεται γὰρ ἐν πᾶσιν). Cf. *de Caelo* I. 7.

Hence it appears that in practice Aristotle uniformly holds it sufficient to base a καθόλου on a review (ἐπαγωγή) of one or more instances, and but seldom attempts an exhaustive enumeration. In *Dialectic*, indeed, it is the business of the opponent to bring forward an objection (ἐνστασις) against such an assumed καθόλου (*Top.* VIII. 8). If he fails to do, he is ruled out of court, and the καθόλου is taken to stand good. But in *Science*, where the subject-matter is μὴ ἐνδεχόμενον ἄλλως ἔχειν, the purpose of ἐπαγωγή is merely to make plain to the mind of the learner the καθόλου, which is undoubtedly there, if only he is able to apprehend it.

In conclusion we have to admit that Aristotle's practice never conforms to his theory of ὁ ἐξ ἐπαγωγῆς συλλογισμός based on ἅπαντα τὰ καθ' ἕκαστον, as set

forth in *Anal. Pr.*, II. 23. Why, then, in this chapter and nowhere else does he call this reviewing of instances συλλογίζεσθαι and συλλογισμός?

I would suggest that here in discussing the nature of our belief (πίστις) in our various statements Aristotle for a moment becomes conscious of the difficulty—felt by so many logicians and psychologists—of making any ultimate distinction between the processes of judging and reasoning. Νοῦς is his name for the faculty whereby we proceed from the προσημιωσκόμενα of sense to the καθόλου manifested in them. In other words it is an intellectual process, and, as such, difficult to distinguish from the process of inferring a conclusion from known premises, which in one passage, if indeed he be the author of the *De Motu Animalium*, he calls νοεῖν. So again in our chapter he tells us: δεῖ νοεῖν¹ τὸ Γ τὸ ἐξ ἁπάντων τῶν καθ' ἕκαστον συγκείμενον, or in the language of modern logic, we must be intuitively satisfied, as we are in mathematics and in mathematics alone, that all possible conditions on which the statement depends are ideally known and cannot from the nature of the case be otherwise. In other non-mathematical sciences such certainty is of course impossible, though Mill at least obviously did not think so, when he asked his famous question—'Why is a single instance in some cases sufficient for a complete induction, while in others myriads of concurring instances, without a single exception known or presumed, go such a little way towards establishing an universal proposition?' None the less, the mathematical καθόλου, which we know to be true κατὰ παντός, always remains the ideal, however impossible to realise, and to my mind something of this sort must be the real meaning of Aristotle's dictum δεῖ νοεῖν τὸ Γ τὸ ἐξ ἁπάντων τῶν καθ' ἕκαστον συγκείμενον.

G. E. UNDERHILL.

Magdalen College, Oxford.

¹ *De Memoria*, I. 5, νοεῖν οὐκ ἔστιν ἄνευ φαντάσματος, and *Met.* Γ. 4. 1006^b 10, οὐδὲν γὰρ ἐνδέχεται νοεῖν μὴ νοοῦντα ἐν.

THE MEANING OF THE WORD ΤΕΛΕΤΗ.

IF we consult the lexicon as to the meaning and usage of the word *τελετή* we find statements of this kind—‘*τελετή* accomplishment, making perfect or complete, *hence* a rite of initiation—*hence* any solemn festival or rite, a mystery.’ Probably as the word ‘*hence*’ passes our lips, some misgiving, however inarticulate, rises in our minds. *Τελετή*, coming as it undoubtedly does from the root which gives us *τελέω*, *τέλος*, *τελευτή*, must in some way be related to the idea of attaining an end, coming to a *τέλος*, accomplishing something. But what is the end attained, the thing accomplished, and how is it ‘attained’ ‘accomplished’ by a rite of initiation?

The current view is that a *τελετή* is so called because by it you *attain* or *accomplish* a certain moral state, you attain to purity and holiness—or some kind of new spiritual perfection. But a moment’s reflection shows that this idea is too abstract to have gone to the making of a primitive word. There must at the outset be some sort of definite, concrete act accomplished; what is it?

The answer is very simple. Indeed, once stated, it is I think obvious; *τελετή* is the rite not of any and every vague ‘accomplishment,’ it is the rite of the first human accomplishment, the rite of growing up or making to grow up, the rite of maturity. In a word, *the rite*, the *τελετή*, is *the world-wide rite of adolescence initiation*. Religious rites—I don’t say the whole of religion—*take their rise in social institutions*. This use of *τέλειος* for ‘grown up’ is, of course, too familiar to need emphasis. It is freely used to express maturity for man, plants, and animals. In the *Geoponica*¹ we hear of young vines and grown-up vines (*τὰς νέας ἀμπέλους καὶ τὰς τελείους*). Aeschylus² expressly and beautifully tells us that trees have, like men, their hour of being grown up.

δένδρων τις ὥρα δ’ ἐκ νοτίζοντος γάνους
τέλειός ἐστι.

Yet in translation this primitive meaning even of *τέλειος* is often forgotten. When in the opening of the *Iliad*,³ Phoebus Apollo slays the host of the Achaeans with his arrows, Achilles wonders if the god may be appeased.

αἶ κέν πως ἀγνῶν κνίσσης αἰγῶν τε τελείων
βούλεται ἀντιάσας ἡμῖν ἀπὸ λουγὸν
ἀμῦναι.

The passage is usually translated ‘the savour of lambs or unblemished goats,’ taking *τίλειος* as meaning ‘perfect,’ ‘spotless.’ But surely the point is the *age* of the victims. Apollo, god of young things, will accept either a young lamb or a young goat, but he prefers them mature, grown up, complete in age and functions. In like fashion Peleus⁴ vowed for Achilles that if he should return safe to his native Thessaly he should ‘shear his hair for the river Spercheios and offer fifty full grown rams (*ἔνορχα*) to the river’s springs. Achilles as full grown *κοῦρος* himself offers grown up rams to the source of all growth, his native river. Further, if I am right, the ‘perfect’ hecatombs of Homer become of course hecatombs of full grown animals as such of much greater value.

ἔρδου δ’ Απόλλωνι τεληέσσας ἑκατόμβας.

Apollo again, a full-grown *κοῦρος*, demands grown up victims. It is the old sympathetic magic.

In the light of this meaning of *τελεία* Hera Teleia wears a new aspect. We have always thought of her vaguely as the goddess who ‘presided over’ who ‘accomplished’ marriage. But she is more and simpler. She is Maturity incarnate, involving of course to ancient thinking marriage. She is the exact counterpart of Hebe—Youthful-Bloom—she is the projected Rite of Adolescence in woman-form. Hera as *Παῖς Τελεία Χήρα* is simply the three ages of man, childhood, maturity, old age. Of these three ages the midmost was to the

¹ 3. 38.

² Nauck, *Frg.* 44. See my *Themis*, 1912, p. 175 ff.

³ I. 66.

⁴ XXIII. 117.

Greeks immeasurably the most important, and is so still to the savage. It alone gave its name to a rite, to *the* rite of Maturity, Τελετή.

This primal basis of maturity was in the Eleusinian Mysteries almost wholly overlaid by moral developments, purification, sanctification, and the like. But it emerges in obscure places of mythology, and never more instructively than in the story of the daughters of Proitos. Apollodorus,¹ quoting Hesiod, tells the tale. In brief the daughters of Proitos, King of Tiryns, went mad, and ranged, lowing like cows, over the mountains. Finally they were healed by the soothsayer Melampous, who married one of them and succeeded to the kingdom of Tiryns. The figure of Melampous takes us back, it may be noted, to early Minyan days.

Now *when* did the daughters of Proitos go mad? Apollodorus is explicit. When they were grown up—ὡς ἐτελείωθησαν, ἐμάνησαν. *Why* did they go mad?

Two reasons are given, both equally instructive. Hesiod says it was because they refused the initiation rites of Dionysos (ὅτι τὰς Διονύσου τελετὰς οὐ κατεδέχοντο). But Akusilaos told a different tale, yet with the like moral. He said it was because 'they held the image of Hera cheap' (διότι τὸ τῆς Ἥρας ξύανον ἐξηντέλισαν). Pherekydes² adds that they made light of the sanctuary of Hera and said their father's palace was finer. We have here probably an echo of the old days when the King, like Oidipos, was head medicine-man (θεός) and the divinity had but a subordinate shrine in his palace. Now Akusilaos was an Argive. He wrote about 525 B.C., and seems to have made a sort of prose Hesiod called *Genealogies*, in which he appears to have corrected Hesiod in matters of local interest.

Who was this Hera at whom, according to Akusilaos, the maidens mocked? Why Hera Teleia herself, she of the Initiation Rite for Women. She was the goddess of the old Heraion, at Stymphalos. She had her triple form as Παῖς, Τελεία, and Χήρα. It was she

who on Mt. Kokkygion wedded Zeus in the form of a cuckoo.³

The two reasons given for the madness correspond probably to two different strata of the primitive religion of Hera and the superimposed cult of Dionysos, but the moral in each case is the same. You must not, dare not, cannot grow up without a Rite of Growing up, a Telete.

The cure of the madness clinches the matter. Melampous pursues⁴ the women 'with a crashing noise and with a certain divine dance' (μετ' ἀλαλαγμοῦ καὶ τινος ἐνθέου χορείας). What the exact nature of the ἀλαλαγμός was we are not told. I should conjecture it was a ritual shout together with the clashing of ritual gear. The ἐνθεος χορεία must have been a ritual dance—in a word the Proitides submit to the ritual which when they were first grown up they resisted, and, once initiated, they are speedily married.

Marriage is to the Roman Church a sacrament, to the Anglican 'an excellent mystery.' To the Greek marriage was *the* Rite of Accomplishment, the τελετή. Life was not lived to the full till it was transmitted. Pollux⁵ says distinctly: καὶ τέλος ὁ γάμος ἐκαλεῖτο καὶ τέλειοι οἱ γεγαμηκότες διὰ τοῦτο καὶ Ἥρα τελεία ἢ ζυγία. Hence the similarity of marriage and initiation ceremonies.⁶ Common to both are the ritual bath of purification and the carrying of the *líknon* for fertility. The Danaides⁷ are ἀτελεῖς γάμου, and in Hades they are 'of those who have not been initiated.'⁸ The preliminary sacrifice before a wedding was called προτέλεια;⁹ the first married night was known as the νύξ μυστική.¹⁰

Initiation among primitive peoples

³ Schol. ed. *Theocrit.* XV. 64. See my *Themis*, p. 180.

⁴ The διωγμός was a regular ceremonial feature, and formed part of the ritual of the daughters of Minyas, the Agrionia, a ritual of which the Proitides myth is a reflection.

⁵ *Th.* III. 38.

⁶ For this whole subject see Mr. Lawson's *Modern Greek Folklore and Ancient Greek Religion*, p. 590 ff.

⁷ See my *Prolegomena*, p. 614.

⁸ Paus. X. 31. 9-11.

⁹ Pollux. *Th.* III. 38, τὰν (τῇ Ἥρᾳ) τοῖς προτέλειος προὔτελλον τὰς κύρας.

¹⁰ Chariton IV. 4.

¹ II. 2. 2.

² ap. Schol. *Od.* XV. 225.

prepares a full grown boy for two duties: he becomes a warrior, he is fitted to be a father. Initiation to a girl who cannot fight is practically merged in marriage.¹ It is interesting, however, to find that among certain tribes of North Australia² a man's initiation is not complete till he is the father of a child. Thus in the Larrakia Tribe a

boy is made a *Beliei*, the first rank of initiation, and can then take a wife, but it is not till he has had his first child that he attains to the rank of *Mullinu*. The initiation as *Mullinu* involves similar ceremonies and a residence in the Bush away from the wife of two or three months. Only after the birth of a child is the cycle of a man's life, his *τελετή*, accomplished.

¹ I owe this suggestion to Mr. Lawson.

² Baldwin Spencer, *Report of Preliminary Scientific Expedition to the Northern Territory*, p. 19. Melbourne, 1912.

J. E. HARRISON.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

THE SOURCE OF PLUTARCH: SOLON XX.—XXIV.

IT is important to establish as far as possible what is the historical authority of these chapters, which contain most of the evidence for the private law of Solon. The question was discussed with care and acuteness by Prinz¹ and Begemann,² and their results have been generally accepted. But both these scholars wrote before the *Ath. Pol.* was discovered, and the time seems ripe to reconsider the question.³

The generally accepted belief is that Plutarch in these chapters has used Didymus *περὶ τῶν ἀξόνων τῶν Σόλωνος*.⁴ The main argument which supports this contention is as follows. It appears highly probable that Plutarch used either Didymus or Hermippus. Diogenes Laertius in his life of Solon used Hermippus largely,⁵ and the laws given by Plutarch, Cc. XX.—XXIV., are not found in Diogenes. Plutarch, therefore, has not used Hermippus here, but Didymus.⁶ Further, Plutarch cites Didymus in the first words of the life, and in C. XXV. may be relying on

the same author for his reference to Cratinus.⁷

These arguments deserve rather closer examination. It is dangerous to suppose that Diogenes has given us in brief all that stood in Hermippus, or has confined himself to the use of that author. The first chapter of his work is a very brief account of Solon's intervention to help the poor. This may well be Hermippus; at least it is very much like a summary of what is found in the certainly Hermippean parts of Plutarch. Then come the laws, and at this point Diogenes dismisses the subject with the exasperating sentence *ἔπειτα τοὺς λοιποὺς νόμους ἔθηκεν, οὓς μακρὸν ἂν εἴη διεξιέναι, καὶ ἐς τοὺς ἄξοντας κατέθετο*. This seems to imply that Diogenes has in his authority a collection of laws attributed to Solon, but most inconsiderately omits them. This is then evidence that a collection of laws was found in Hermippus at this point, rather than evidence to the contrary. And it is not improbable that Plutarch, when he reached this point in Hermippus, was less afraid of his readers' impatience, and so used the collection in the chapters under discussion.

To return to Diogenes. After the sentence cited above, that unstable writer turned to discuss the affair with Salamis, and thence to the times of

¹ R. Prinz, *De Solonis Plutarchei Fontibus*. Diss. Bonn., 1867.

² H. Begemann, *Quaestiones Solonicae*, Spec. I. Diss. Holtzminde, 1875.

³ The ultimate source was believed to be the *Ath. Pol.* Oncken, *Staatsl. des Ar.* II., p. 419 ff., p. 435.

⁴ E.g. Busolt, *Gr. Gesch.* II.², p. 59.

⁵ Nietzsche, *De Laertii Diogenis Fontibus*, Rh. Mus. XXIII. (1868) p. 632 ff., XXIV. (1869) 181 ff., XXV. (1870) p. 181 ff.

⁶ Begemann, p. 20.

⁷ M. Schmidt, *Didymi Chalcenteri Fragmenta*, p. 29 ff.

Peisistratus. In these paragraphs there is nothing which bears a likeness to those parts of Plutarch where Hermippus has clearly been used. It is therefore natural to suppose that Diogenes has turned to another authority. In that case the few laws which immediately follow in C. VII. of the *Solon* are probably from this other authority, and so may not be called in judgment against the Hermippean origin of the laws in Plutarch.

The negative argument from Diogenes does not therefore seem to justify the deductions which have been drawn from it.

The positive arguments do not appear more conclusive. The reference to Didymus in Plut. *Sol.*, C. I., and the probable reference in C. XXV., prove neither that Plutarch has used that author throughout the life of Solon—for the points are in each case quite incidental—nor that Didymus *περὶ τῶν ἀξόνων* was more than a discussion of the character of the *ἄξονες*,¹ a question which set ancient antiquarians at sharp variance.² Nor do the references to the numbers of the *ἄξονες* prove anything against Hermippus. The reference in C. XXIII. is clearly derived from Demetrius of Phalerum,³ who was as likely to be consulted by Hermippus, as by Didymus.

There appears, then, to be no cogent reason against a use of Hermippus in these chapters. Not only so, but there

are positive indications which deserve to be considered.

First, there is the use of the antithesis between *νόμος* and *φύσις*,⁴ which is not characteristic of Plutarch himself, but much rather of the early Peripatetic School. And this Peripatetic colouring is likely enough in Hermippus, and not so likely in the matter-of-fact grammarian, Didymus.

Moreover, Begemann⁵ has well pointed out that the reference to Lycurgus in C. XVI. is a hint of Hermippus, whom Plutarch used also for the life of the Spartan sage. The same argument seems to apply with equal force to the reference to Lycurgus in C. XXII.

A third point is the use of *ἴδιον*⁶ with reference to some of Solon's laws in these chapters. The word implies a comparison of Solon's work with that of other lawgivers. But it is unlikely that Plutarch has made himself an authority on Greek Lawgivers *ad hoc*. If then the credit is due to his source, that source is more likely to be Hermippus *περὶ Νομοθετῶν* than Didymus *περὶ τῶν ἀξόνων*.

Finally, there is a general and well-founded agreement that the historical narrative which immediately precedes these chapters is based on Hermippus. We must then suppose a break between C. XIX. and C. XX. if the use of Hermippus is abandoned. But I have sought to show elsewhere⁷ that Plutarch's authority for Cc. XII-XIX. gives the substance of the source used in the corresponding chapters of the *Ath. Pol.* If that conclusion is accepted, it is possible to make a further deduction.

At the end of C. XIX. Plutarch is using Hermippus. Is the beginning of C. XX. continuous with this, or is there a break? The answer is given by the *Ath. Pol.*, C. VIII., where the source, which Hermippus and Aristotle used in common, discusses the powers of the Areopagus, and then continues with the law against political indifference. The same collocation of subjects is found at the end of Plut. *Sol.*, C. XIX., and the beginning of C. XX. The col-

¹ A slight indication that this was the case may be seen in the fact that the lexicons which go back in the main to Didymus do not discuss the contents of the laws under the headings *ἄξονες* or *κύρβεις*, as they might perhaps have done if Didymus had put such information into his book *περὶ τῶν ἀξόνων*. Didymus is the probable source of such notes as those on *ἐπιμύροτος* (Pollux. VIII. 151), *κλέπος* (*ibid.*, c. 34), *ἐπαίτια* (*ibid.*, c. 23); but even these may come from his voluminous *λέξεις* (Schmidt, p. 11 ff.) or from notes on the orators. See Berlin Papyr. and Harpocration, *ὁ κάτωθεν νόμος*; Blass in *Hermes*, VII., p. 151 ff.

² Sandys on Ar. *Ath. Pol.* 7. § 3; Szanto in Pauly-Wissowa, s.v. *ἄξονες*; Gilliard, *Quelques Réformes de Solon*, p. 30 ff. Didymus' work seems to have been polemic—*ἀντιγραφὴ πρὸς Ἀσκληπιάδην*. Probably there was much in Asclepiades to correct, to judge from Etym. Guder., p. 355, s.v. *κύρβεις*.

³ *περὶ τῆς Ἀθηνησιν νομοθεσίας*.

⁴ C. 20.

⁶ C. 20, 24.

⁵ *Op. cit.*, p. 16 f.

⁷ *Klio*, 1912, pp. 1-16.

location cannot be called obvious, and the only natural explanation is that Hermippus and Aristotle found that order in their common source, and so Hermippus is Plutarch's authority for the beginning of C. XX., as well as the end of C. XIX. And if the beginning of C. XIX. is Hermippus, the paragraphs that follow are too closely connected with it to come from another authority. For these reasons it seems at least highly probable that the authority of Plut. *Sol.*, C. XX-XXIV., is that of Hermippus, and not of Didymus. This result is not unimportant, for careful as Didymus certainly

was, it is yet more reassuring to have to deal with the earlier authority, who wrote at a time when original *ἄξωνες* of Solon might still be seen at Athens,¹ when the copies made after 403 B.C. were still in use. For at some later date much of that evidence was lost, so that in the time of Plutarch only 'scanty fragments' (*λείψανα μικρὰ* Plut. *Solon*, C. XXV.) of the *ἄξωνες* were still preserved.

F. E. ADCOCK.

King's College, Cambridge.

¹ Polemo, Fr. 48, F.H.G., iii. 130; Euphorion ap. Apollod., F.H.G., i. 432.

'ALCUMENA EURIPIDI.'

IN a recent article in the *Classical Review* (p. 159) Professor Slater proposes an emendation (*ruina* or *Ruina*) in Plautus *Rud.* 86, on the ground that 'some generalization would be more natural in this context, to suggest "a storm such as blows in the pages of Euripides," rather than the name of a single character (however demented) from a play that has perished.' If it were a question of emending a corrupt line, I should have something to say by way of criticism on prosodic grounds of Professor Slater's *ruina*. But it is the object of the present article to show that the line is not corrupt. When I edited the play I did not fully understand the passage, as my note shows; but that I was guided by a right instinct in regarding the text as sound I can now prove. The line runs—

Non ventus fuit, verum Alcumena Euripidi.

'Talk of a wind! This was not a wind, but a regular *Alkmene* of Euripides.' There is no reference to a 'demented person.'¹ The reference must be to the storm which was a prominent feature in the *dénouement* of the play of

Euripides. This part of the action is exhibited in two vase paintings, which are discussed by several authorities and interpreted in such a way as to throw a flood of light on the line of Plautus quoted above. It was my friend Mr. W. C. F. Anderson who first called my attention to Mr. A. S. Murray's article in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, 1890, pp. 225 f. (plate 6). Dealing with the *Alkmene* vase by Python, now in the British Museum, Mr. Murray speaks of a tempest of rain as the chief feature of the response to *Alkmene's* pleading: the vase shows a rainbow and two *Hyades* pouring streams of water from *hydriae*. And he describes *Alkmene* as sitting on an altar for refuge. Whether it is an altar on which she sits I do not know. I take the following account of the plot of Euripides' last play from Wissowa-Pauli (article *Alkmene*).² "In the *Alkmene* of Euripides Amphitryon condemns his faithless wife [*i.e.*, the wife whom he regards as guilty of adultery] to be burned to death. But the pyre (*Scheiterhaufen*) is extinguished by a storm of rain sent by Zeus. Thereupon Amphitryon recognizes the operation of a divine power." The plate in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies* shows *Alkmene* sitting on something and raising her hand to implore the pro-

¹ My reviewer in the *Athenaeum* (1891) proposed to change *Alcumena* into *Alcumeeo* (= *Alkmaeon*), adding that 'it is almost impossible that Euripides should have described a passion of *Alkmene* which might serve as the basis of a comic exaggeration.' There is no question of a *passion* of *Alkmene*.

² See also the article *Alkmene* in Roscher's *Lexicon*, p. 247.

tection of Zeus, her unknown paramour. I gather that it was Engelmann who first suggested that the scene depicted on the vases must have formed part of the story of the lost play of Euripides (Programm of 1882 and *Archaeologische Studien zu den Tragikern*, 1900, to which Mr. B. J. Hayes called my attention some years ago). The story has disappeared from literature; but it has left a trace behind in the allusion which Plautus makes to it in *Rud.* 86. In the *Amphitruo* of Plautus the thunder-storm which accompanies the birth of the twins belongs to a different version of the story: see lines 1094 ff., 1062, 1067. But it is worth noting that in both versions the tragic story of Alkmene is connected with a storm.

Wind is not necessarily accompanied by rain; and it may be objected that *Rud.* 86 speaks only of *ventus*. But the particular storm referred to was accompanied by rain; see l. 576 f., where the slave Supernio, who has not been shipwrecked, says (in reply to a request from the shipwrecked Charmides for some dry clothes) *Tegillum eccillud—*

mihi unum id aret: id si vis, dabo. Eodem amictus, eodem tectus esse soleo, si pluuit. 'Here is a wrap—it is the only dry thing I have got,' etc. He had evidently been out in the rain. The *tempestas* of the *Rudens* was *turbida* (l. 940: may not this mean 'dirty,' 'rainy'?); and in l. 96 there is a reference (rather obscure) to *lutum*. Compare also the metaphorical tempest in *Most.* 162-4 *quom mihi Amor et cupido in pectus perpluit meum*.

But while the general drift of the line of Plautus quoted above is clear, I admit that his form of expression is strange. Yet it is not unintelligible. Let us try one or two English parallels: 'Talk of a deluge! This was no ordinary deluge, but a regular Book of Genesis.' 'Talk of love at first sight! This was nothing less than a *Romeo and Juliet* of Shakespeare.' The literary work in which the thing compared forms a prominent feature is substituted for the thing itself.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

The University, Birmingham.

NOTES ON THE COMMONITORIUM OF ORIENTIUS.

Non potuit (sc. Balaam) proprie motam sibi subdere linguam,

Ora aliud dicens, corde aliud cupiens,
Nam male dicturus nimie benedicere coepit,
Impendens aliis *ora* parata aliis (l. 35 sq.).

Ora is wrong. It has come in, as Dr. Purser pointed out, through the influence of 'ore,' and evidently covers some word like *vate*, on which it was a gloss. The point is that Balaam had lost completely the control of his tongue, which reversed all that seer's prepared utterances, meting out to 'these' the things prepared by the seer for 'those':

Impendens aliis *vate* parata aliis.

fata might also be a suitable reading, although not so easily explained.

Agmina venanti procumbunt densa ferarum;
Icta procul jaculis vel laqueata plagis
Prona petis ferro, canibus fugientia sistis;
Contundis frenis ora ferocis equi (l. 145 sq.).

The difficulty here is *prona*. Professor Ellis compares 'pronus lepores' (Ovid,

Met. X. 538). Bellanger renders 'blot-ties à terre.' Debrio explains 'prona' as *pascentia*, browsing cattle. But this is impossible, as Orientius is describing sport. The word *pronus* rather implies aggressiveness, cf. 'pronus pendens in verbera telo' (*Aen.* X. 586), of Lucagus bending forward to throw his weight into his stroke. The reference would then be to animals like the wild boar, which charged with head down, ταυρηδὸν ἐγκύψας κάτω (Aristoph. *Ran.* 804), and were hunted with spear and javelin. In the corresponding passage of Rutilius, l. 621 sq. we have—

Terribilisque cadit fulmine dentis aper.

In ll. 181 sq. Orientius wrote a description of the catastrophe that had befallen the people of Gaul.

Mors, dolor, excidium . . . incendia, luctus,
Uno fumavit Gallia tota rogo.

The difficulty is to fill up the gap. Sordes, strages, clades, etc., have been

suggested. But the omission of such striking words is not satisfactorily explained. I would suggest that the two words *unda fames* have been lost through the confusion of *unda* with the termination of 'excidium' or the beginning of 'incendia.' 'Unda' having dropped out, 'fames' would naturally follow suit. These words complete the picture and the number *seven*, the line being possibly a reminiscence of 'the seven plagues.' They are suitable, for an inundation of the Garonne would add to the miseries of the Gallic nation and would be supported by the verses of Orientius, II. 190:

Praetereo gladiis quantum quantumque ruinis
Igni, graminibus, fluminibus liceat.

The point in favour of *fames* is that famine is the first evil that falls upon a conquered and devastated country. That there was such a famine in Gaul at this time the *Confession* of St. Patrick (19), 'Et XXVIII. dies per desertum iter fecimus et cibus defuit illis et fames invaluit super eos. . . . Quia nos a fame periclitamur,' is proof.

Continuing his description of the miseries of Gaul, he wrote:

Praetereo gladiis quantum, quantumque ruinis,
Igni *graminibus*, fluminibus liceat (II. 190).

Graminibus is explained as poisonous herbs. But such are not usually employed by invaders. It is also questionable if it can mean this without qualification. *Grandinibus* has been suggested. But the pentameter, like the hexameter, requires an antithesis, especially a word that is a natural contrast to water, such as lightning. Lucretius, *De R. N.*, VI. 201, described lightning as seeds of fire:

Et ignis
Semina convolvunt e nubibus. . . .

If Orientius wrote

Ignes seminibus, fluminibus liceat,

he would have a balanced verse and a phrase from his favourite, Lucretius. The reading *Igni graminibus* might also be explained. The loss of the *s* before the following *s*, or *vice versa*, is a frequent error. A scribe would make nothing of the reading *Igni seminibus*, if

he was ignorant of the Lucretian phrase, and would write down some word that would scan even if he had the reading *Igni seminibus* before him, especially as Orientius used the word *seminibus* in a good sense in II. 58, and strangely enough in conjunction with *gramina noxia*:

Protinus et lentas et *gramina* noxia messi
Seminibus victis heu male laeta feret.

One more emendation:

Intereunt decies qui terno vixerit annos
Atque illum vixit qui modo *missile sim*.

Various emendations have been offered for this 'locus vitiatus.' Professor Ellis suggests

Atque illum vixit qui modo mille simul.

Bellanger emends:

Atque dies luxit cui modo vix decimus.

The thought seems to be that we die daily no matter what our span of years may be. 'They pass away, both he who has lived thirty years, and he who has lived that year which has but lately sped.' This is evidently the meaning of the writer. He intends to contrast a short life with a moderately long life. And we have this by reading *missus erit* for 'missile sim' (A).

Atque illum vixit qui modo missus erit.

A² reads 'missile sim,' but has *si* marked for omission. The metaphor might be from the racecourse: 'Carcere misit equos' (Ovid), or from the phrase 'missa est ecclesia.' 'Missile' might be right. It certainly would puzzle the scribe. 'Missilia,' rarely if ever found in the singular (this would be no obstacle to Orientius, who used 'illecebra'), are largesse scattered among the people by the Emperor, 'Sparsa et populo missilia' (Suet., *Ner.* II.), and so would be metaphorically used of the gifts of fortune.

Atque illum vixit qui modo *missile sit*

might be a possible reading, but the rule is in such a case to keep the harder reading. However, 'missile sit' might easily have originated from 'missūerit,' (*missus erit*), which we prefer.

F. R. MONTGOMERY HITCHCOCK.

NOTES ON THE AGRICOLA.

THE following notes are intended, not to describe new finds, but to sum up, for teachers and others who may not have followed them, recent Romano-British discoveries and researches which illustrate the Agricola of Tacitus.

Ch. 12. *Fert Britannia aurum, etc.* Clear traces of Roman gold-mining survive near Dolaucothy—well-wrought drainage tunnels, extensive workings, a rock-hewn reservoir, and an aqueduct cut for five miles along the side of the Cothy valley to bring it a constant water supply. I have described them in the *Transactions* of the Carmarthen-shire Antiquarian Society (v. 14, June 4, 1909).

Ch. 13. *Monstratus fatis Vespasianus.* From Suetonius, etc., it is plain that Vespasian commanded the Second Legion and conquered southern Britain. A tile of that Legion, found at Seaton, perhaps dates from these operations (*Ephemeris Epigr.* ix. 1268).

Ch. 14. *Quaedam civitates Cogidumno, etc.* It may be worth mentioning that the Goodwood inscription of Tiberius Claudius Cogidubnus pretty certainly belongs to the middle or third quarter (not the end) of the first century. Its lettering suggests that period; and the objection urged by Furneaux and others that the phrase 'Domus Divina,' which occurs in it, does not recur elsewhere till much later, is wrong; the phrase occurs, quite in its ordinary sense, on a north-Gaulish inscription of the reign of Tiberius (*CIL.* xiii. 4635) and in the coeval Phaedrus. Probably, therefore, the Goodwood inscription does refer to the Tacitean Cogidumnus.

Ch. 16. *Colonium invasere.* A relic of the loot may be the large bronze head, closely resembling Claudius, which was found by itself about five years ago near Woodbridge (Suffolk). Not improbably it was torn from the Temple of Claudius in the Colonia by British pillagers and thrown away later on.

Ch. 17. *Petilius Cerialis Brigantum . . . aggressus.* The northern limit of the Brigantes lay near—perhaps south of—the Tyne and Solway. As P. C. did not overrun all their land and

fought, as Tacitus says, with mixed success, his annexations can hardly have extended beyond (if so far as) latitude 54. The recent suggestion (*Arch.* lxi. 311) that he occupied Carlisle is therefore unlikely; the Flavia objects found there (see on ch. 22) must date rather from Agricola.

Ch. 21. *Templa fora domus extruerent.* The remains of Silchester and Bath (see *Victoria Hist. of Hants.* i. 276, *Somerset.* i. 222), of Wroxeter and Caerwent, all imply that Romanisation grew apace in the Flavian period. Possibly it began even before Agricola came out; he would therefore be adopting, not starting, a tendency. I have tried elsewhere (*Ancient Town-Planning*, pp. 127 foll.) to explain how far Romano-British towns exhibit the plan and public buildings of a normal Roman city. Silchester (as I have there said) looks like an attempt to municipalise the Briton which outstripped the readiness of the Briton to be municipalised. Whether Wroxeter will turn out the same, or something more (or less) civilised, remains to be seen.

Ch. 21. *Linguam Romanam.* Graffiti on tiles and potsherds found in Romano-British towns and country-houses show that, sooner or later, Latin must have been spoken and written even by the lower classes in many parts of the province (*Romanisation of Roman Britain*, ed. 2, p. 25 and figs. 2-5). It may be noted that the Flavian age (about A.D. 80) first gave Britain *legati iuridici*, and their appearance indicates an extension of the Roman lawcourts in the island (*Rh. Mus.* xlv. 601).

Chs. 22, 23. Excavations carried out during the last twenty years in northern England and in Scotland have thrown much light on the movements of Agricola. On the west coast Samian potsherds of Flavian date have long been recognised at Carlisle, and a tile of the Ninth Legion may be coeval (*Archaeological Journal*, 1892, p. 199). Nothing of the sort, however, occurs north of Carlisle, save that Birrenswark, near Ecclefechan, a native hill-fort encircled by Roman blockading lines, recalling those

of Alesia in miniature, can best be assigned to the Agricolan age. This was perhaps Agricola's furthest on that side of Scotland. His real advance was near the east coast. Corbridge, Cap-puck, Newstead on the Tweed, are Flavian sites, and the still visible Roman road from Corbridge to the Forth through these places, often called Deer Street, must date from him.

Ch. 23. *Clota et Bodotria . . . praesidiis firmabatur*. Of these forts we have traces at Bar Hill (Macdonald, *Roman Forts on the Bar Hill*, Glasgow, 1906, and *Roman Wall in Scotland*, p. 188), and at Castle Cary (*Wall*, p. 211), and the *lilia* of Rough Castle seem also to be Agricolan (*Wall*, p. 232). Camelon, near Falkirk, was also a Flavian fort, as the pottery figured in the Proceedings of the Scottish Antiquaries, 1900, p. 381, declares (compare Macdonald, *Wall*, p. 385; Curle, *Newstead*, pp. 78, 271).

Ch. 24. *Hibernia . . . portus per commercia cogniti*. The Roman remains actually recorded from Ireland indicate very little intercourse with Britain during the first two centuries, and that only on the east coast: see the detailed list in the *English Historical Review* for January, 1913. It seems incredible that Roman troops can have invaded Ireland, or even that Roman merchants visited it very much. Note that Tacitus, so far as his meaning can be divined from a corrupt passage, writes rather cautiously. For *melius* is weaker than either *bene* or *optime*. That there was then a brisk sea-borne traffic between Ireland and Gaul, as Zimmer and others imagine, seems wholly unlikely.

Ch. 25 foll. North of the Forth, a few Flavian remains have been found in the imperfectly explored fort at Ardoch (Curle, *Newstead*, p. 271) and more in the large camp Inchtuthil, where Tay and Isla meet. Ardoch was a *castellum*; Inchtuthil looks like a campaigning base for a largish force during a longish time; it is not a 'Marschlager' for a week or two. For such a base it is geographically well suited. The Romans obviously advanced along the natural route from Camelon, through Stirling Gap and Strathearn and Strathmore and the north-eastern Lowlands, very

much along the modern railway line from Stirling to Aberdeen. This indeed was their only way if they were to avoid the Grampian Hills.

Ch. 29. *Ad montem Graupium*. The mention of a fleet as used in this final campaign shows that it was conducted where (as has just been said) we should geographically expect. The lowlands of Forfar, Kincardine, and Aberdeen actually contain several large encampments which must be Roman if the published, but not very authentic, plans of them are at all correct. The most northerly of these, at Ythan Wells, almost in the latitude of Inverness, was examined with the spade by Dr. Macdonald and myself last summer, and may be accepted as Roman, though we could not fix its date within the Roman period. This particular site does not agree well with the battle-field as dimly sketched by Tacitus. Till we know whether the Boresti (Ch. 38) lived north of the battle-field, as one would almost think, or south of it as Furneaux suggests, and till we know where they lived at all, it will be hard to place Mons Graupius. Inchtuthil, however, seems both too far south and too much of a base to support a strong claim.

Ch. 38. *Circumvehi Britanniam*. Did the fleet really sail right round? Tacitus does not say so, and *circum*, like the English 'round,' does not imperatively require a completed circle. Perhaps the fleet just sailed up the east coast far enough to see the land trend away westwards, and then came back. The Usipi seem to have been the first to prove Britain an island.

May I add one other point for teachers? If they desire to illustrate lessons or editions of the Agricola, they should select remains of Flavian date. Some years ago I had to review an edition of which the notes were admirable, but the illustrations included, as Roman remains, the Bronze age fortress of Maiden Castle in Dorset, the fourth-century fort of Pevensey and the Norman castle of Colchester, and a thirteenth or fourteenth century bridge across the Calder. Recent finds, particularly Mr. Curle's at Newstead, provide plenty of really Agricolan objects. I am not

quite sure that Mr. Curle has not found the name of Aulus Atticus scratched on a bit of armour, plainly a relative of Agricola's or his wife's, for Atticus is

the only one of his officers who is named in the biography.

F. HAVERFIELD.

Headington Hill, Oxford.

F. H. ON PORTUS ITIUS.

F. H. PERHAPS expects me to say something in reply or in assent to his article on Portus Itius. My view is still that 'the case for Boulogne cannot be regarded as absolutely proved, because, if there is only one real objection, that objection may not safely be ignored.' I am absolutely certain that Caesar sailed from Boulogne in 55 B.C.: to suppose that he sailed from any other port involves nautical impossibilities.¹ I am not certain that he sailed from Boulogne in 54; for he then had 800 ships instead of 100. When a well-known bookmaker laid 200 to 1 against Aboyer on the night before last year's Derby, the balance of probability was greatly in favour of his winning the bet. But he lost.

F. H. says that he wishes 'only to emphasize two points.' As I am not sure which they are, and he seems to me to emphasize four or five, I will notice them all.

'The question,' says F. H., 'appears to me to be not whether the harbour [of Boulogne] was large enough for Caesar's purpose—we know far too little to hope to prove or disprove that—but whether we have reason to believe that Caesar did use this harbour then. If so, it must have been large enough.' We want something more than 'reason to believe.' One does not say 'We have reason to believe that Lutecia stood upon the site of Paris': that it did so is beyond dispute. If we can demonstrate that Caesar did use this harbour in 54 B.C., we need not insist that it must have been large enough. But unless we can demonstrate that he could not have used Wissant, we cannot demonstrate that he did use Boulogne. Whether F. H. can do that remains to be seen.

'I cannot but think,' says F. H., 'that he [Holmes] has overrated Napoleon's difficulties.' No. If the officers who were in charge of Napoleon's fleet overrated them, so did I; but not otherwise. All that I did was to report the relevant facts as they are stated in volumes iii. and iv. of Captain Desbrière's authoritative work—*Projets et tentatives de débarquement aux îles britanniques*; and anyone who refers to the pages from which I quoted can control my statements.

'We have no proof,' continues F. H., 'that Caesar's fleet was 800 strong in 54 B.C.' Nobody ever said that his fleet, properly so called, was 800 strong; but we have proof that what F. H. calls 'the whole armada' was. As F. H. observes, 'What Caesar himself says is that . . . when he at last set out and reached Britain . . . the whole armada, including ships which he had kept over from 55 B.C., and ships of private owners (*quas sui quisque commodi causa fecerat*), exceeded 800.' F. H. then says with perfect truth that 'Caesar's war-ships and transports in 54 B.C. can hardly have exceeded 660.' But he adds that 'these 250 [150?] private ships, wherever they were, can hardly have been allowed to interfere with Caesar's plans. If he could not have got them out of the harbour, he would have left them there.' Certainly; and if he could not have got the 660 ships out of the harbour, he would have left them there. But since the private ships as well as the 660 ships were visible off the British coast, he did not leave them there. Does F. H. mean to suggest that the 'private ships' did not sail from Portus Itius at all, but from Ambleteuse? That is perhaps conceivable: but nobody else, as far as I remember, has made the suggestion; and surely Caesar's narrative implies that war-ships, trans-

¹ *Ancient Britain*, pp. 558, 581-3, 613, etc.

ports, and private ships all sailed from Portus Itius.

F. H. then tells me that I have cited 'a nautical opinion . . . (*Conquest of Gaul*, ed. 2, 1911, p. 438) that even 800 ships could have been got out in the available time.' That is true (except that F. H. ought to have said 'within two hours'); but it is not the whole truth. The 'nautical opinion' was that '*given sufficient depth and extent of water the feat might have been accomplished.*' But that is the very condition which is uncertain; and anyone who reads the footnote in which the opinion was quoted will see how much that is important F. H. has left out.

F. H. then turns to Wissant. 'The sand dunes of Wissant,' he says, 'provide neither a harbour for 6-800 ships, nor a camping-ground for 40,000 men. . . . There is not water in the place for anything like that army, especially at midsummer, and it is known that this is no new feature of Wissant; in the Middle Ages we have several references to the *ariditas loci*. No doubt the sea-passage . . . is shorter than that from Boulogne; therefore it was used from about A.D. 950-1350 by men in a hurry, by merchants, by small bodies of passengers. But sailing authorities declare that it is not so good or easy a crossing, and no case is recorded where it has been used by even a small army.'

There was camping-ground at Wissant if sufficient water was forthcoming; and as this is the most important point, I will reserve it to the last. It is true that there is no harbour now; but in mediaeval documents Wissant is frequently called a *portus*; and since it was not only used constantly in the Middle Ages, but was also a nest of pirates who harassed the Cinque Ports,¹ it must have provided some accommodation for ships. Moreover, the ships which Caesar built for the expedition of 54 B.C. were so constructed that they could easily be hauled up on shore. The sudden decay of the port may have been due partly to the Hundred Years' War, partly to vast irruptions of blown

sand.² Is F. H. quite sure that no case is recorded where Wissant was used even by a small army? Not to mention the *milites non parvi numeri*,³ who accompanied Edward the Confessor's brother to Dover, John of Hainaut led an army of 2,000 men in 1327 to assist Edward III. against the Scots;⁴ and it is certain that a large army sailed from Wissant in 1173. According to Benedict of Peterborough,⁵ Robert, Earl of Leicester, *cum exercitu transfretare in Angliam festinavit*, landed in Suffolk *cum infinito exercitu Flandrensi*, and was defeated soon afterwards with the loss of 10,000 men. According to Ralph de Diceto,⁶ the earl sailed on this expedition from Wissant (*venit apud Wissant, ubi . . . plurima comitante caterva, navem ascendit*). The number, 10,000, may be exaggerated, and *infinito exercitu* may be a rhetorical expression; but the two texts are evidence that a large army sailed from Wissant. No doubt the shortness of the passage was one reason for its popularity; but during those four centuries Wissant was used as a port much more often than Boulogne,⁷ and among the 'small bodies of passengers' were important personages, who were apparently in no hurry—for instance, *tam Abbates quam Monachi plusquam centum, praeterea militarium virorum et negotiatorum plurima multitudo*,⁸ Henry II.,⁹ Lewis VII.,¹⁰

² Information about the harbour, such as it was, the sand dunes, and the period of their formation will be found in my books.

³ M. Bouquet, *Recueil des hist. des Gaules*, xi. 40C.

⁴ *Oeuvres de Froissart*, — *Chroniques*, ii. 109 (ed. Kervyn de Lettenhove).

⁵ *Gesta regis Henrici secundi Benedicti abbatis*, ed. W. Stubbs, i. 60.

⁶ *Radulphi de Diceto . . . opera hist.*, ed. W. Stubbs, i. 377. In *Ancient Britain*, p. 580, I remarked that 'Benedict does not say that the army set sail from Wissant.' This is true, but irrelevant; for Benedict says that the earl landed *cum infinito exercitu*; and Ralph says that he sailed from Wissant.

⁷ In the index of Benedict's work Wissant is mentioned in connexion with thirteen voyages, Boulogne with none; in the index of Hoveden's Wissant with eight, Boulogne with none; in the index of Matthew's Wissant with three, Boulogne with one.

⁸ M. Bouquet, xi. 133C.

⁹ *Chronica . . . Rogeri de Houedene*, ed. W. Stubbs, ii. 302, 317.

¹⁰ *Ib.*, p. 192.

¹ *Matthaei Parisiensis Chronica Maiora*, ed. H. R. Luard, iv. 238-9.

envoys of Edward III., Philippa of Hainaut, whom he was about to marry, and envoys of Philip VI.¹ Why did all these people deliberately prefer Wissant to Boulogne, which was only twelve miles off? And in those four centuries—how many cases are reported where Boulogne was used by an army?

It remains only to consider F. H.'s assertion that 'there is not water in the place for anything like' an army of 40,000 men. The *infinitus exercitus* wanted water: so did the army of Edward III in 1346;² and if springs can supply an army for one day, they can supply it for twenty-five. There are three small rivulets at Wissant; but I do not know how many men they would have supplied. As to springs I have received the following information from the President of the Administrative Council of Wissant: 'Il y a entr'autres trois sources extrêmement abondantes. La plus rapprochée de la mer est celle qui se trouve sur la "Motte du Vent," que j'ai marquée d'un crayon rouge sur le plan inclus. Actuellement cette source débite une eau d'une extrême limpidité avec un débit de 80 M³ d'eau [80,000 litres] par jour. A environ 2½ km. de Wissant se trouve le village d'Herlen; là se trouve une source beaucoup plus abondante encore. Un ruisseau en amène l'eau à la plage après avoir alimenté sur sa route le moulin Quenu. Le débit de cette source est de deux à trois cents M³ [200,000–300,000 litres] par jour. Il y a encore

¹ *Oeuvres de Froissart*, ii. 191, 194, 227, 232.

² *Oeuvres de Froissart*, v. 81-2.

³ '80 M³' means 80 cubic metres. One cubic metre contains 1,000 litres, or about 222 gallons.

à St. Po (3 km. de Wissant) des sources qui alimentent la propriété de la Mine d'Or et le moulin de Sombres; ces eaux vont ensuite se déverser à la mer.'

I would say no more if F. H. did not 'feel' that my 'last argument against Boulogne'—the argument by which I endeavoured to show that the identity of Portus Itius with Boulogne cannot be regarded as absolutely proved—'is really special pleading.' 'Special pleading,' when the expression is not used in its technical sense, means 'the specious, but unsound, argumentation of one whose aim is victory, and not truth.' If F. H. considers my argument (undesignedly) specious, but unsound, or merely unsound, I take the criticism in good part. But to suggest that my aim is victory, and not truth, is not what I should have expected from him. There is one fact which alone disposes of the imputation of special pleading. The article on Portus Itius in *Ancient Britain* was well received. Several critics who had studied the question regarded it as conclusive—amongst others Dr. Meusel, who has read every line of the book and of both editions of *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*. But when I had consulted Captain Desbrière's volumes, the conviction was forced upon me that it was not conclusive—that, in the present state of our knowledge, to work out the argument for Boulogne to demonstration was impossible. If my aim had been victory, and not truth, I would have said nothing; and nobody would have been any the wiser. Therefore I have no fear that what F. H. feels will be felt by the readers of the *Classical Review*.

T. RICE HOLMES.

NOTES

EMENDATION OF EURIPIDES, BACCHAE, 677-678.

If my restoration is correct, we may add another example of the hitherto unknown simple form ἀκρίζειν to the tragic thesaurus. In *Hippolytus* 469 ἀκρίζουσι means 'keep on the top' (νῶτα θαλάσσης.

Cp. Aesch. *Ag.* 286 πόντον νωτίσαι), but in *Bacchae* 678 ἀκρίζον means *up-rising* (to an ἄκρον).

Porson considered βροχήματα the subject of the verb, Sandys the object, whereas in fact it is neither. In all the interpretations I have examined πρὸς λέπας seems pointless, or superfluous;

μόςχων has given endless trouble (Sandys proposed βόσκων in 1880, but gave it up in 1885); while ὑπεξηγκρίζον has proved a veritable nightmare to scholars from Hesychius down. Sandys finally decided in favour of μοχθῶν, which is both palaeographically and lexicographically preferable to βόσκων. But it is difficult to see how the word is pertinent to the description. As a matter of fact the whole passage becomes vague if we read πρὸς λέπας μοχθῶν. The emendation μύχων must be ruled out of court entirely. Murray's 'greyest coldest time' is evidently for μοχθῶν—and for 'time.'

I believe that ὑπεξηγκρίζον is a combination of two words. Elision is responsible for the confusion. Some copyist wrote ὑπήξε (instead of ὑπήξ') and the inserted final ε supplanted the succeeding initial vowel (α), ὑπηξακρίζον becoming ὑπηξεκρίζον. Then ηξε naturally changed to ἐξη, since the verb was thought to be a compound in the imperfect indicative. But the initial vowel was not originally υ. The poet wrote ἀπήξ'. But the copyist was obliged to change to ὑπεξ (since there is no ἀπεξ) when he saw ηκρίζον before his eyes. Cp. Soph. *O. T.* 227 (ἐπεξε-λῶν changed to ὑπεξελῶν) and Ar. *Ran.* 468 (ἀπήξας changed to ἀπήξας). Possibly even ὑπήξ' could be justified by *Hec.* 53.

The intransitive ἀκρίζον goes with λέπας, which is a *rufes*, not a place to pasture cattle. Ida sent the courier-flame πρὸς Ἑρμαῖον λέπας (*Ag.* 283); Eurystheus surveyed the plain below λεπαίαν ὀφρύην καθήμενος (*σκοπεῖ Heracl.* 394); while in Thuc. 7. 78. 5 we read λόφος καρτερός καὶ ἐκατέρωθεν αὐτοῦ χαράδρα κρημνώδης, ἐκαλεῖτο δὲ Ἀκραῖον λέπας. Now it was from just such a λέπας ἀκραῖον (or ἀκρίζον) that the herdsman was able to descry θιάσους τρεῖς γυναικείων χορῶν (mark the *τρεῖς*). And what attracted his attention to this particular cliff? The cows, which had darted away from their calves to the point of (supposed) danger. And why at this particular time? Because it was precisely when (ἡνίκα) 'the first rays steal earthward.' Ever more alert to note something unusual in their surroundings, animals

would observe the presence of the bacchanals sooner than men. And daylight was necessary in this instance, since the poet wished to represent the herdsman as having *seen*, so that he could report to the king. The messenger *has* seen, and is come posthaste and breathless (ἦκει δὲ ποῖαν προστιθεὶς σπουδὴν λόγου); he is not wasting words; he goes to the kernel of the matter at once (ἄρτι is significant) and tells *what happened*, not what he himself was doing. In fact the messenger had already informed the king in 661 that he had come from the heights of Cithaeron, and there was no occasion for repeating the statement, least of all to declare that he had been working his weary way with his lowing kine up toward the beetling crag—even if the apparently impossible Greek could be forced to yield such a sense.

J. E. HARRY.

University of Cincinnati.

EURIPIDES, *BACCHAE*, 659.

Ἡμεῖς δέ σοι μενούμεν, οὐ φευξοῦμεθα.

So MSS. and Edd. No doubt a meaning of its own can be forced into σοι (either 'Ethic' or Dat. Commodi), for σοι cannot go with μένειν, which always requires an accusation. Perhaps read σὼ μενούμεν, from σῶς: notice that σοι has occurred at the end of the preceding line: the colloquial tone would be in place with the context, displaying in language the εὐοργησία which the speaker recommends in l. 641. To the other instances of σῶς or σῶος μένειν in LS add Anonymi <Μοιχευτρία>, l. 187, in Crusius' *Herodas*, Edit. Minor⁴, p. 116 = *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Vol. iii., p. 50.

μένουσι σῶοι, δέσποτα.

The short form of the masculine plural is attested by Aelius Dionysius, s. 202, Schwabe, for Thucydides [I. 74], and it has been restored by Cobet in Xen. *Anab.*, 2. 2. 20; see Kühner-Blass, I., p. 542.

A correction must be made in LS⁸ s.v. They quote σῶς from Demosth. *de Pace* 17 and *de Cherson.* 16 as being nominative plural; but in both places

it is accusative plural. A similar slip appears to be made in Preuss' *Index Demosthenicus*; he places 'σῶς Nom. m. Dem. 21 [*Midias*], 126' among the plural forms of σῶος and σῶς, but there it is nominative singular.

J. U. POWELL.

St. John's College, Oxford.

A NOTE ON THE WORD KPHΔEMNON.

THE κρήδεμνον was a veil drawn across a woman's face to screen her from the gaze of strange men: metaphorically the word is applied to the town-walls which screen the city from the gaze of the enemy. Thus far Stephanus and Liddell and Scott, but the reference to Euripides (*Troades*, 508) under the second heading confuses the issue and has led translators astray.

The passage runs

ἄγετε τὸν ἄβρὸν δῆποτ' ἐν Τροίᾳ πόδα,
νῦν δ' ὄντα δούλον, στιβάδα πρὸς χαμαι-
πετῇ
πέτρινά τε κρήδεμν', ὥς πεσοῦς' ἀποφ-
θαρῶ
δακρύοις καταξανθεῖσα.

which is rendered thus in the latest version (Dr. A. S. Way, Loeb Library):

Guide me—who once in Troy walked delicately,
Who am a slave now—to some earth-strewn
bed,
Some rocky brow, to weep mine heart away
And hurl me then to death.

Here it will be noticed that the translator draws the inference—surely a false one—that because κρήδεμνον is used metaphorically of the walls that screen a town, it can be used actually for the walls or battlements themselves, and so πέτρινα κρήδεμνα becomes 'some rocky brow,' from which apparently Hecuba is to commit suicide.

But as Jebb has shewn long ago, this is not the way in which the Greeks used metaphor, and the sense is strangely perverted.

Professor Murray's translation

Take this slave that once trod high
In Ilion: cast her on her bed of clay
Rock pillowed, to lie down and pass away,
Washed with tears,

NO. CCXL. VOL. XXVIII.

as might be expected, keeps much closer to the spirit of the original and is almost exact if a pillow be used, not to rest one's head on, but to hide one's face in; although of course κρήδεμνον does not mean 'pillow.' But neither of the translations gives quite the real meaning, for to Euripides, the apostle of the women's revolt, the word has some special associations.

The κρήδεμνον was more than a mere article of woman's dress: it was, like our cap and apron, the symbol and outward sign of woman's position. The Greek wife was enslaved to one man, her husband, and the mark of her slavery was the κρήδεμνον, which gave her the white cheeks of a harem odalisque, and shut her out from the open world. The only way to escape from this slavery was to become a slave indeed. The slave woman walked abroad freely with face uncovered, and this is what Euripides means when he makes Andromache say

αὐτὰ δ' ἐκ θαλάμων ἀγόμεν ἐπὶ θῖνα
θαλάσσας
δουλοσύναν στυγερὰν ἀμφιβαλοῦσα
κάρᾳ.

(*And.* 109.)

'And I, even I, was dragged from my bower to the sea beach, with nothing about my head—save hideous slavery.' The pathos of the passage in the 'Trojan Women' depends on the same idea. The old queen, barefooted and bareheaded, has put off for ever her sandals and yashmak, and now, if she is to hide herself from men, it must be with rougher coverings.

'Guide me,' she cries; 'ah, my feet walked softly once in Troy, though now they are enslaved: guide me to my bed of straw upon the ground, and to the stones which now will hide my face, so that I may fling myself down and die, worn out with tears.'

F. A. WRIGHT.

DEMOSTHENES' LEPTINES,

Ch. 7 and Ch. 139.

Ch. 7.—καταμεμφόμενον τοὺς ἐπὶ ταῖς
ὑπαρχούσαις δωρεαῖς. . . . So the original reading in all MSS. For τοὺς,
τινας S margin, L suprascr. Of these,

τοὺς is exceptionable as (i) doubtful Greek (so a MS. note of Professor S. H. Butcher's); (ii) unsatisfactory sense. L. is not represented as disparaging the recipients of public grants generally, but as arguing sophistically from the case of a few unworthy to the whole system of public grants; *cf.* immediately below ἀνάξιοι τινες (whence the v.l. τινας of S and L) κατὰ τὸν τούτων λόγον εἰσίν: ch. 38, ὅτι νῆ Δί' ἥσαν τινες . . . ἀνάξιοι: *cf.* ch. 56 *ad init.* On the other hand, τινας (i) could not give rise to v.l., τοὺς (ii) violates Blass's rules of rhythm, (iii) is weakly supported: probably a simplification by a corrector of the S text, suggested by ἀνάξιοι τινες below. I would suggest καταμεμφόμενον τοὺς <καὶ τοὺς> κ.τ.λ. —'disparaging such and such persons' —corrupted by haplography to τοὺς with loss of the intervening καί.

Ch. 139.—σκοπῶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο καὶ μὴν οὐδ' ἐκείνου γ' ἀποστατέον τοῦ λόγου, ὅτι. . . . So MSS. Editors delete σκοπῶ . . . τοῦτο, supposing a twofold recension with Blass—rather a far-sought theory—and unnaturally attributing to the jurors a wish to 'back out' of the speaker's arguments. Such a wish could, however, be reasonably expected of Leptines: so perhaps we should write—σκοπῶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο—καὶ μὴν οὐδ' ἐκείνω γ' ἀποστατέον τοῦ λόγου—ὅτι. . . 'I also consider—and this is an argument that not even Leptines can afford to neglect—that. . . .' We cannot keep ἐκείνου, which clashes with τοῦτο if it refers forward, and can only refer backwards in violation of usage. On the other hand, ἐκείνω could easily be corrupted by assimilation to τοῦ λόγου.

R. J. SHACKLE.

Marlborough College.

REVIEWS

SOME MATHEMATICAL BOOKS.

1. *Archimedis opera omnia cum commentariis Eutocii*. Iterum edidit J. L. HEIBERG. Vols. I. and II. Pp. xi+445, and xviii+554. Teubner, 1910, 1913.
2. *Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia*. Vol. IV. *Heronis Definitiones cum variis collectionibus, Heronis quae feruntur geometrica*. Edidit J. L. HEIBERG. Pp. xxix+450. Teubner, 1912.
3. *Des Claudius Ptolemäus Handbuch der Astronomie aus dem griechischen übersetzt, und mit erklärenden Anmerkungen versehen von KARL MANITIUS*. 2. Band. Pp. vi+446. Teubner, 1913.

It was in the year 1879 that, in his *Quaestiones Archimedaeae*, a dissertation for the doctorate at Copenhagen University, Heiberg foreshadowed the issue of a new Greek text of Archimedes. The dissertation contained preliminary matter necessary to a critical edition, *e.g.* chapters on the contents and order of the separate treatises, on the MSS.

and editions, on the dialect of Archimedes, besides chapters on the life of Archimedes, his mechanical inventions, and on 'arithmetic in Archimedes'; it concluded with a text of the short treatise, the 'Sand-Reckoner,' with critical notes, offered as a sample instalment of the contemplated new edition. The edition itself followed at a very short interval, Vol. I. in 1880, and Vols. II. and III. in 1881. Since that time the editor has been steadily placing the student of Greek mathematics under greater and greater obligations by the issue, at surprisingly short intervals, of trustworthy texts of Euclid's *Elements*, with scholia, in five volumes (1883-1888), Apollonius of Perga in two volumes (1891-1893), Euclid's *Optics*, etc. (1895), Serenus Antinoensis (1896), Ptolemy in three volumes (1898-1907), and finally the fourth volume of the Teubner edition of Heron, to say nothing of Simplicius's commentary on Aristotle's *De caelo* in the Berlin series of commentators on Aristotle (1884), a total of achievement

on the part of one editor for which I suppose it would be extremely difficult, if not impossible, to find a parallel.

These editions were in each case the first which came up to the modern standard of textual criticism. When, at the revival of learning, the Greek mathematicians began to be studied and edited in the original Greek, they were edited by mathematicians rather than by scholars. The mathematical content being, from the editors' point of view, the important consideration, they based their texts upon the first MS. that offered, taking little or no trouble to collate others or to consider questions of relative authority. The *editio princeps* of Archimedes, published by Thomas Gechauff Venatorius at Basel in 1544, was based on the MS. known as N^a, a MS. written in the sixteenth century and only a copy at second-hand of the Florentine MS. of the fifteenth century originally called F by Heiberg and now D=*Cod. Laurent.* xxviii. 4. Torelli's edition, the only complete text before Heiberg's, followed the *editio princeps* in the main, though he collated V, now E=*Codex Venetus Marcian.* 305, of fifteenth century; the book was brought out after Torelli's death by Abram Robertson, who collated five more MSS., including F; but the collation was not well done, and the edition was not properly corrected when in the press.

The necessity for the second edition of Archimedes, of which Vols. I. and II. are now before us, arose through the discovery of important new sources. The first of these is the original Latin translation of the works of Archimedes made by William of Moerbeke, which was discovered at Rome in 1884 by Valentin Rose. The importance of this translation lies in the fact that it was made in the latter half of the thirteenth century, and followed word for word a Greek MS. of which no trace now remains, but which was much older than any we now possess. The second of the new sources is even more important. The story of its discovery in 1906 is almost romantic, and has now been more than once told by Heiberg himself (in *Hermes*, Vol. XLII., 1907, p. 235 f., and in the preface to the

present Vol. II.). His attention having been called to a notice in Vol. IV. (1899) of the *Ἱεροσολυμιτικὴ βιβλιοθήκη* of Papadopoulos Kerameus relating to a palimpsest of mathematical content, he at once inferred from a few specimen lines which were quoted from the MS. that it must contain something by Archimedes. This was confirmed when he inspected the MS. itself. With the exception of the last leaves, 178 to 185, which are of paper of the sixteenth century, it is of parchment, and contains writings of Archimedes copied in a good hand of the tenth century, in two columns. An attempt had been made (fortunately with only partial success) to wash out the old writing, and then the parchment had been used again, for the purpose of writing a *Euchologion* thereon, in the twelfth to thirteenth or thirteenth to fourteenth centuries. The importance of the palimpsest is due to the fact that it contains an entirely new treatise of Archimedes, called the *Method*, which was supposed to be lost. Until the discovery of the *Metrica* of Heron by R. Schöne at Constantinople, it was only known by name from an allusion to it by Suidas; but the *Metrica* quotes three propositions from it, and it was a remarkable stroke of luck that within a few years the propositions themselves should come to light in the new MS. The treatise is historically and intrinsically one of the most interesting of all the works of Archimedes. The MS. also contains a considerable portion of the Greek text of the work in two books *On Floating Bodies* (*περὶ ὀχουμένων*), hitherto only known in the Latin translation due to William of Moerbeke, as well as two short fragments, besides the preface, of a work called *Stomachion* (as it might be 'Neck-Spiel' or 'Qual-Geist'), which treated of a sort of Chinese puzzle known afterwards by the name of 'loculus Archimedi.' The text of the *Method* was originally published in *Hermes*, Vol. XLII., 1907, but since then Heiberg has been able to decipher more of the MS., so that, in the new edition, a number of gaps have been filled or reduced. Some two-thirds of the Greek text of the treatise *On Floating Bodies* are also now incorporated, besides the unimportant

fragments from the *Stomachion*. The new MS. has also been useful in other places; e.g. in it we have before us for the first time in full the preface to Book I. *On the Sphere and Cylinder*, for the old MS. no longer extant which formed the basis of the traditional text was in that place so rubbed as to be illegible. On all grounds we welcome the new edition and shall look forward to the appearance of Vol. III., which will contain Eutocius' commentaries and will complete the critical apparatus by the discussion of the MSS. in detail and their relation to one another.

Vol. IV. of the collected edition of Heron's works is an important addition to our texts of Greek mathematicians. Vol. I., by Wilhelm Schmidt, published in 1899, included the *Pneumatica* and *Automata* in Greek, with German translation, and Vol. II. (1900), by L. Nix and W. Schmidt, the *Mechanics* in Arabic and German, with the fragments of the original Greek which have survived in Pappus and Eutocius, and a fragment of the *Catoptrica*. Most important was Vol. III., edited by Hermann Schöne (1903), containing the *Metrica* and the treatise *De Dioptra*. The *Metrica* was supposed to be lost, but was found by R. Schöne in a Constantinople MS. of the eleventh century (*Codex Constantino-politanus palatii veteris*, No. 1). This and the discovery above-mentioned of the *Method* of Archimedes (also at Constantinople) constitute the most important finds made for many years from the point of view of the historian of Greek mathematics. But a new edition was much wanted of the works included by Hultsch in his *Heronis Alexandrini geometricorum et stereometricorum reliquiae* . . . et anonymi variae collectiones ex Herone, etc., published as long ago as 1864. Vols. IV. and V. of the new editions are to contain these works. These volumes were to have been edited, like the first, by W. Schmidt, but the work was interrupted by his illness and untimely death in 1905, and it was taken over by Heiberg, who of course had placed at his disposal all the material collected by Schmidt. Vol. IV. now issued contains two large divisions, the *Definitiones* and *Geometrica*.

As compared with Hultsch's edition it shows considerable changes of arrangement and substantial additions. The additions come mainly from the same Constantinople MS. which contain the *Metrica* and from V (= *Cod. Vaticanus Gr.* 215, of the fourteenth century). For the Geometry more use has been made of C (= *Cod. Paris. Suppl. Gr.* 387), to which Hultsch did not pay sufficient attention. The discussion of the MSS., their relations and relative authority, is postponed for the preface to Vol. V. The rearrangement above-mentioned was determined on by Heiberg, in view of the difficulty caused by the fact that the different MSS. contain partly the same and partly different matter. Hence he decided to make the whole of the geometrical portion and the whole of the stereometrical portion into two separate groups. Where the new MSS. used contain matter corresponding to that in the MSS. used by Hultsch, but in different form, he has put the two versions side by side on the same page with letters in the margin showing the MSS. from which they come. The greatest interest and weight will attach to the views of the editor already stated in the volume before us, or to be hereafter stated in Vol. V., as to the genuineness or otherwise of the various works attributed to Heron. Even the *Definitions* were suspected by Tannery, but Heiberg has no hesitation in attributing this work to Heron himself. On the other hand, of the other collections included by Hultsch, he omits the *Liber Geoponicus* as a whole, only incorporating a few chapters containing genuine extracts from the Heronian writings; these chapters are inserted in the *Definitions* and *Geometrica* in their proper places; cf. the interesting problems in indeterminate analysis now *Geom.* 24, 1-2 (= *Geopon.* 78, 79). The *Geodaesia* is also omitted because it contains little more than a few small extracts from the *Geometry*. On the other hand, some metrological chapters found in the MSS. have been inserted which were published by Hultsch, not in the Heronian collections, but in his *Metrologicorum scriptorum reliquiae*. The appearance of this Vol. IV. is altogether welcome, and we may be sure

that, when Vol. V. is published, we shall have the advantage of all that modern textual criticism can do towards settling the vexed question of the genuineness or otherwise of the various collections going by the name of Heron and providing a thoroughly trustworthy text of those works which satisfy the test.

Heiberg's texts of the Greek mathematicians have in general been accompanied by Latin translations, with all necessary notes, which have not only shown that he has a thoroughly competent knowledge of mathematics, but have probably brought it within the power of most mathematicians to read the treatises for themselves; in the case of Heron, Vol. IV., the translation is in German, doubtless for the sake of uniformity with Vols. I.-III. But in the case of Ptolemy's *Syntaxis* the Greek text appeared alone, without any translation. There was naturally some disappointment on the part of mathematicians, which found amusing expression in the review of the first volume by M. Cantor (*Zeitschrift für Math. u. Physik*, Vol. XLIV., 1879, Hist.-litt. Abt. p. 62-63, who observed that the smile of pleasure with which he greeted the appearance of the volume soon gave place to a more serious expression when he observed the absence of the Latin translation which he had been accustomed to look for in Heiberg's editions.

Heiberg himself in his preface gave the modest explanation that, in view of the difficulty of the subject, he had not ventured to add a translation, either in Latin or in a modern language; astronomers must see to the matter and do it

for themselves if they required a translation. To which Cantor replied by the despairing question, Where is the living astronomer who knows enough Greek, or the Greek scholar (except Heiberg) who knows enough astronomy, to undertake the work? Fortunately the translator has now appeared, and the omission is repaired. The translation is in German, and not in Latin, but that is no real drawback; and as to the competence of the translator no one will feel any doubt who has made the acquaintance of the Greek astronomical works already edited by him, namely, Geminus' *Εἰσαγωγή εἰς τὰ φαινόμενα* (or *Elements of Astronomy*) and Proclus' *Hypotyposis astronomiarum positionum* (Teubner, 1898 and 1909 respectively). The translation endeavours, where possible, by the use of modern notation, instead of the cumbersome Greek terminology, to make the book more readable by mathematicians. The figures of Heiberg are improved and new ones added where a difficult passage could be better elucidated by a figure than by verbal explanations; occasionally sentences are inserted in brackets to make the connexion clear, short notes are added at the foot of the page, and there are longer notes, where necessary, in appendices at the end of the volumes, besides a list of the passages where the text of Heiberg has been departed from. We may say without hesitation that no one could usefully attempt to follow Ptolemy's exposition without having this translation before him; it is therefore with gratitude to the editor and the publisher that we greet its appearance.

T. L. HEATH.

THE ANIMALS OF THE ANCIENTS.

Die Antike Tierwelt. Von OTTO KELLER. Zweiter Band: Vögel, Reptilien, Fische, Insekten, u.s.w., mit 161 Abbildungen im Text und zwei Lichtdrucktafeln. Large octavo. Pp. xv + 617. Leipzig: Engelmann, 1913. M. 17; cloth, M. 18.50.

HOFRATH OTTO KELLER, formerly a Professor in the Universities of Freiburg, Graz, and Prag, and now residing at Stuttgart, is well known as one of the editors of Keller and Holder's critical recension of Horace. He is a leading authority, not only on the textual criti-

cism of Horace, but also on the animals of the ancient world. In 1887 he published a series of monographs on the ape, the camel, the buffalo, the chamois, the deer, the bear, the tiger, the panther, the hyaena, the wolf, the fox, and the jackal; the seal, the hippopotamus, and the dolphin; and, lastly, the eagle, the woodpecker, the goose, and the night-ingale. These monographs, which included quotations from *loci classici*, and were embellished with fifty-six illustrations, formed a volume of 488 pages, published by Wagner at Innsbruck under the title of *Thiere des classischen Alterthums in culturgeschichtlicher Beziehung* (M. 10.80). Shortly afterwards Professor Keller was associated with Imhoof-Blumer in the preparation of a comprehensive collection of twenty-six plates, comprising no less than 1,352 reproductions of ancient coins and gems, exhibiting representations of animals and plants, with descriptive letterpress. This interesting and important work was published by Teubner in 1889 as *Tier- und Pflanzen-bilder auf Münzen und Gemmen des klassischen Alterthums* (M. 24). In 1906, while he was still a Professor in Prag, he kindly wrote at my request a very brief survey of the fauna of the old Roman world, which, as translated by myself (with the aid of several eminent zoologists), filled some eighteen pages of the *Cambridge Companion to Latin Studies* (revised edition, June, 1913).

Professor Keller has followed up his *Thiere des classischen Alterthums* by an important work on a far ampler scale, under the title of *Die Antike Tierwelt*. The first volume, dealing with the *Mammalia* in 434 large octavo pages, with 145 illustrations and three photographic plates of coins, was published in 1909 (M. 10; cloth, M. 11.50). It was noticed by the present writer in the *Cambridge Review* for December 8, 1910. The work is now completed by a second volume, including birds, reptiles, fishes, insects, spiders and scorpions, worms and caterpillars, crabs and lobsters, star-fishes and sea-urchins, jelly-fishes, corals, and sponges.

The Birds fill nearly half the volume. The survey begins with eagles, falcons, vultures, owls, and parrots. Next in

order come the *Scansores* or *Picariae*, including the woodpecker, the wryneck, the kingfisher, the hoopoe, the cuckoo, the blue roller, the goat-sucker, and the bee-eater. Under the general heading of 'song-birds' we have thrushes, wrens, wagtails, larks, finches, sparrows, and starlings; crows and ravens; jackdaws and jays and magpies; swallows and fly-catchers; tomtits and orioles. Then follow pigeons and doves, fowls and pheasants, peacocks and guinea-fowls, the ptarmigan, the partridge, the quail, and the woodcock; the *brevipennes*, including the ostrich, the crane, the stork, the ibis, the heron, and the flamingo; the *natatores*, including the swan, the goose, the duck, and the coot; and, lastly, among the sea-birds, the pelican, the cormorant, the stormy petrel, and the various kinds of gull.

The ancient lore of all these birds is fully set forth. Thus we incidentally learn that, in Assyria and Egypt, the vulture was once considered a sacred bird, a character in which it was gradually superseded by the eagle. The wryneck (*iunx torquilla*) is recognised as a magical bird in Greek literature alone, but is completely ignored in Latin. While the Latin writers make no mention of the magical bird, it may here be noticed that they occasionally refer to the magic wheel—the *amoris rota* of Plautus, *Cist.* 207, the *turbo* of Horace's *Epodes*, xvii. 7, and the *rhombus* of Martial ix. 29, 9. The bird is, at the present time, rare in Greece but common in Italy, and it may here be suggested that possibly its rarity (apart from its other peculiarities) made it specially suited for magic rites. The kingfisher (*ἀλκύν*) necessarily leads to a discussion of the 'vulgar error' of the 'halcyon days.' It also reminds the author of his former home in Prag, where the kingfisher is conspicuously visible as the crest of the King of Bohemia, Charles IV., on the tower at the Altstadt end of the Karlsbrücke.

Lesbia's *passer* is here (as in the *Companion to Latin Studies*) identified with the blue thrush, the Italian *passere solitario*. The raven and crow and the other *Corvidae* are dealt with in more than twenty instructive pages. On p. 83, in the notice of the wren (*regulus*), the

author repeats the singular suggestion made by himself in the *Archiv* for Latin lexicography (iv. 139), that, when (in Pliny's *Letters*, i. 5, 14) Modestus denounces Regulus as *omnium bipedum nequissimus*, he is playing on the word *regulus*, one of the Latin names for the wren—'the most minute and contemptible of birds.' This suggestion is rightly rejected in Merrill's edition, p. 178. In Lewis and Short's Dictionary, by the way, *regulus* is vaguely rendered 'a small bird,' and the reference is wrong; it should be 'Auct. Carm. Phil. 43' (not 13), *regulus atque merops et rubro pectore progne* ('Carmen de filomela,' no. 762, l. 43 in Riese's *Anthologia Latina*). On p. 86 we are told that probably the original name of the finch (*fringilla*) was *akalanthis* (where we should have expected a reference to the *Pax* and *Aves* of Aristophanes), and that this name is found as late as Paulinus of Nola, *Carm.* 23, 12, 'vere novo resonant acalanthida dumi'; but surely this is only a fresh proof that Paulinus, the pupil of Ausonius, was familiar with his Virgil, and accordingly remembered and reproduced the last three words of the line in the *Georgics*, iii. 338, 'litoraue alcyonen resonant, acalanthida dumi.' Again, on p. 215, the author states that the legend of the Song of the Dying Swan is not found earlier than Plato, whereas a glance at the *loci classici* in Dr. D'Arcy W. Thompson's admirable *Glossary of Greek Birds* (a work which the author often quotes), would have reminded him of the celebrated simile, applied to Cassandra in line 1,444 of the *Agamemnon* of Aeschylus, κύκνον δίκην, τὸν ὕστατον μέλψασα θανάσιμον γόον.

Under the heading of Reptiles (pp. 247-322) we have adequate and comprehensive notices of tortoises and snakes, frogs and toads, the crocodile, the lizard, the chameleon, and the salamander.

Fishes are comparatively briefly dealt with in little more than seventy pages, of which as many as thirty form a general introduction, followed by a summary conspectus of the principal kinds, with the Greek and Latin names of each, and concluding with a fuller treatment of a few of the more interesting varieties: the eel, the murrey, the mullet, the turbot, the salmon, the carp, the stur-

geon, the ray, the shark, and the tunny, this last being the most important fish in the Mediterranean trade, and accordingly filling more than twelve pages of text.

Under Insects (pp. 395-460) a special interest attaches to the pages on ants and bees and wasps; silkworms and moths; the grasshopper and the locust; the cricket and the mantis. Butterflies are figured on several Egyptian monuments (as in Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, iii. 41, 42, 52, ed. 1842), but are apparently never mentioned in extant Greek poetry, though they might easily have supplied a tempting theme to writers of Anacreontic verse or to the epigrammatists of the Greek Anthology. On p. 419 the author vaguely refers to the latter for an epigram on some clever ants who ferried themselves over on bits of straw to a jar of honey which a rustic had placed in the middle of a pail of water. Some of his readers would have welcomed the exact reference, ix. 438, or (at least) the first two words of the epigram, βολοτόμοι μύρμηκες. He is equally vague in stating, in general terms, that the incident agrees with the evidence of modern observers. It is therefore perhaps necessary to point out that the evidence is definitely quoted (and is also disputed) not only in Lubbock's *Ants, Bees and Wasps*, pp. 239-247 (a work well known to Professor Keller), but also in a less familiar treatise, Wasmann's *Psychology of Ants* (E. T. 1905), pp. 131-139.

Ten pages on spiders are followed by as many more on scorpions, in the course of which the testimony of two English travellers is quoted on p. 472 in support of the belief that scorpions commit suicide when tortured by fire. The true explanation may be found in Mr. R. I. Pocock's article in the current edition of the *Encyclopaedia Britannica*:—the animal dies, not from a self-inflicted wound, but really in consequence of the heat, which incidentally provokes it to brandish its tail right and left in attempting to drive off the unseen enemy.

In the rest of the work the most interesting articles are those on the polypus and the cuttle-fish, on the three varieties of shellfish used in the manufacture of

purple dye, and on pearls, and oysters. Even fossil shells are not omitted.

In the present, as in the former volume, we have frequent mention of ancient superstitions, and various points of folk-lore, together with many topics on which the statements of ancient writers are either corrected or confirmed by modern research. Thus the description of the pigmies, given by Herodotus and others, is, in a general way, confirmed by the discovery of the Akkā of Central Africa; and the account of the capture of birds by the Thracians of Kedreipolis, with the aid of flocks of wild hawks, as stated in the *Historia Animalium*, ix. 36, is supported on p. 24 by the observations of a recent traveller in Central America. The account in the *Historia Animalium* is here attributed to Theophrastus, who, on p. 507, is also credited with the singularly accurate description of the molluscs and other marine animals in the immediately following chapter. I do not know how far those who attribute these descriptions to Theophrastus have taken into consideration the fact that Aristotle himself lived for three years (347-343 B.C.) at Atarneus, in full view of Lesbos, so that he may have been almost as well informed about the fauna of the neighbourhood as his pupil, who was a native of the Lesbian town of Eresos. Details as to the Euripus of Pyrrha in the island of Lesbos are not confined to the above passage in the *Historia Animalium*, which is ascribed to Theophrastus. They may also be found in v. 12 and 15, and in viii. 20; and *De Partibus Animalium*, iv. 5, p. 680.

The highest praise must be given to the excellent illustrations, which are largely due to the author's own enterprise. Many of them are selected from the author's above-mentioned work on coins and gems, from Wilkinson's *Ancient Egyptians*, from vases and sculptures in the British Museum, and from the mosaics of Pompeii or of Northern Africa. In one of the Pompeian mosaics, here published for the first time, no less

than twenty-three kinds of fishes can be distinguished and identified. The illustrations deserve to be recorded in a separate list, with an exact statement of the source of each. A fuller list of the Greek and Latin names of the animals described in the two volumes would have been a welcome addition to the index. As it is, if we wish to look up the account of the hoopoe, we find neither ἑποψ nor ὑπούφα, but only *Wiedhopf*.

The author is specially interested in matters of Etymology, and derives some of his elucidations from Semitic, as well as Egyptian, sources.

His work might have been made more uniformly easy to read, if all the references now embedded in the text (as well as the 431 notes at the end of the book) had been transferred to the foot of the page. The unfortunate result of the adoption of another method may be seen, in an extreme case, in the following paragraph on p. 43:

Die Eule ist eben überhaupt in der ganzen Welt gewöhnlich ein sehr trauriges Vorzeichen, im Rigveda (X. B.) so gut wie bei den alten Griechen (Hipponax 54, Artemidor III. 65) und Römern (Ammian. Marcell.), bei den Neugriechen (Schmidt, Volksleben I. 136), Wenden (Veckenstedt, wend. Sagen 316), Russen (de Gubernatis, mythol. Zoologie, deutsch S. 529), Polen (H. Sienkiewicz, Gegenwart 1893 S. 105), Ungarn (Wlislöcki 73), Talmudisten (Lewysohn, Zool. des Talmud 163) usf²² (a reference to a note at the end of the book).

Daremberg and Saglio's *Dictionnaire des Antiquités* has long shewn scholars of all nations a more excellent way.

As a whole, however, Keller's *Antike Tierwelt* is undoubtedly an interesting as well as an important work. It deserves to be warmly welcomed by the student of folk-lore, by the zoologist, and by every classical scholar who wishes to realise for himself the Fauna which formed part of the life, and often found a place in the literature, of the ancient Greek and Roman world.

J. E. SANDYS.

St. John's House, Grange Road, Cambridge.

HETTITER UND AMAZONEN.

(1) *Hettiter und Amazonen*. Die griechische Tradition über die 'Chatti' und ein Versuch zu ihrer historischen Verwertung. Von WALTER LEONHARD. I vol. 8vo. Pp. x+242. Leipzig-Berlin: Teubner, 1911. M. 8.

(2) *Religious Cults associated with the Amazons*. By FLORENCE MARY BENNETT, Ph.D. I vol. 8vo. Pp. 79. New York: Columbia University Press, 1912.

'I AM weary of my life because of the daughters of Heth,' said Rebekah, and her plaint has been echoed by a generation of scholars. To-day all is changed; the Hittites have come to stay, and Dr. Leonhard's book is the mythological firstfruits of what promises to be an abundant harvest. Its contention is briefly this. In the myths of the horse-loving, axe-bearing Amazons, in the stories of Penthesilea, of Hippolyte, of Myrina, their sudden onset and their swift pathetic downfall, are reflected and embodied traditions as to the dress, manners, customs, nay, the very geographical distribution, of the Hittites—traditions preserved by the survivors of those Ægean peoples once in close, and for the most part hostile, contact with an alien civilisation.

Modern mythological science, in seeking the origin of a myth, is bound always to ask first and foremost the question: *What is the social structure that the myth reflects?* When this question is put of the Amazon myth, we are at once involved in a difficulty. The salient feature in the Amazon myth is that the women usurp the functions of men. This is quite alien to the Greece we know. Moreover, the Amazons are an *ἔθνος ἵπποπόλον*; their queen was *Hippolyte*. No Homeric or post-Homeric Greek civilisation reflects these traits. We must perforce seek a non-Greek culture. Neither Egypt nor Babylonia nor Crete supply the necessary factors.

An inexorable logic drives us to the Hittites, and, once the comparison suggested, the evidence of correspondence is overwhelming. The Hittites appear and disappear from the field of history

with a swiftness and a suddenness truly Amazonian. About 1390 B.C. the Egyptian records of Thutmosis III. tell us of the Hittite ruler Subbiluliuma and his inroad into northern Syria. Mursil, who crossed the Orontes, stands probably for the climax of Hittite invasion. In 1270 B.C., after long conflict, Chattusil II. makes peace with Ramses II. and the boundaries are fixed between them. By the close of the same century the Cheta or Hittites have disappeared as swiftly as they came. It was but a dominion of 150 years. We now know in part the cause of this sudden emergence and disappearance. The Hittite kingdom in Asia Minor was based on the dominion of a strong Assyrian colony, founded about 1600 B.C. on the Halys. The bilingual inscriptions in Hittite and Babylonian found at Boghazköi prove this. The same tale is told by the marked Assyrian influence in Hittite sculpture.

This century and a half was a period of swift bloom and wide diffusion. Boghazköi stands at the crossways of four great natural highways, one going north through the valley of the Iris to Themiskyra on the Black Sea; another northwest to Sinope, another 'Amazon' town; the third, taken later by the Persians, westward through the Hermos Valley to Magnesia, Sipylus, Smyrna and Ephesus: this route is shewn with 'Hittite' monuments. The fourth road, roughly parallel to the third, connects the tableland of Boghazköi with Karia and Lykia—Lykia the home of Bellerophon and his Amazon fight. No one can follow Dr. Leonhard's minute examination of the lie of Amazon myths and Hittite monuments without seeing that the correspondence outruns all possibility of coincidence.

It is, however, his examination of Hittite religion that is at once most interesting and most convincing. It has long been vaguely conjectured that in the Amazons we have possibly some reflection of a strange androgynous priestly caste—Essenes, or Eunuchs. To these vague conjectures Dr. Leonhard gives definite, more probable and less

repulsive shape. In the recently-discovered Hittite inscriptions the King of the Hittites is named as 'the Incarnation of the Sun.' But the Sun to the Hittites, as to the Germans, is feminine. The King then was accounted a goddess. Dr. Meyer has recognised this Sun-goddess on the reliefs of Jasilikaja. Now it is not likely that the goddess will become a man to please the King, but the King, if identification is to be, may well assume the garb of a woman priestess. This is in effect what takes place, and it is this ritual fact that is reflected in stories like that of Herakles and Omphale.

At the back of all this lay, of course, what Dr. Leonhard calls the 'perverse' notion of the bisexed god, with the chief emphasis, as was natural in a fertility god, on the side of the mother. If divinity is to be dowered with sex, if the god is to have 'body parts and passions,' it is scarcely 'perverse' that this sex should be bisexual. The misunderstanding of such a conception by the Greeks was no doubt helped out by unaccustomed details of dress. Hittite warriors wear long robes, pointed shoes, a tiara-like headgear, earrings, and are close-shaven. Such details might easily suggest a shift of sex. Palaephatos (*de incred.* 33) long ago hit the mark. It was not women warriors who went to battle, but barbarians clad—to Greek thinking—like women. Ἀμαζόνες ἔνιοι λέγουσιν ὅτι οὐκ ἦσαν γυναῖκες αἱ στρατεύσασαι, ἀλλ' ἄνδρες βάρβαροι. ἐφόρου δὲ χιτῶνας ποδήρεις καὶ τὴν κόμην ἀνεδοῦντο μίτρας, ἐξυρῶντο δὲ καὶ τοὺς

πώγωνας, καὶ διὰ τοῦτο ἐκαλοῦντο παρὰ τῶν πολεμίων γυναῖκες.'

Dr. Leonhard says his book is that of a beginner. We detect no immaturity, and must offer him both thanks and congratulations on a piece of work at once solid and illuminating. The Amazon myth is a good instance of the way in which the magic of Greek imagination transmutes tradition and bewilders the scientific investigator, but Dr. Leonhard has found the clue and tracked the labyrinth.

Close upon the appearance of Dr. Leonhard's book follows Dr. Bennett's monograph on the *Religious Cults associated with the Amazons*. The myth of the Amazons to Mr. Leonhard reflects, as we have seen, a civilisation that of the Hittites; to Dr. Bennett it mirrors a cult that of Cybele. Dr. Bennett, in a note to p. 74 (360), cites Mr. Leonhard's book, but we find it difficult to think she has read it. She finds the clue to the Amazon myth is the Cretan cult of the Mother. The cult of the Mother it does reflect, but geographically the Amazon myth has no home in Crete. The strength of Dr. Leonhard's argument is that he plainly tracks the myth along the line of Hittite monuments in Anatolia. The Amazons are of the North and East, not of the South. Dr. Leonhard's demonstration is founded on facts; Dr. Bennett's treatment, we regret to say, too vague, discursive, and allusive to be convincing, though her book may serve as a useful collection of references.

X.

ANCIENT METHODS OF COMMUNICATION.

Das Nachrichtenwesen des Alterthums mit besonderer Rücksicht auf die Römer.
Von WOLFGANG RIEPL. 8vo. Pp. xiv+478. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 16; bound, M. 18.

THE writer gives the widest interpretation to the term 'Nachrichtenwesen,' which is only translatable into English by liberal periphrasis. He makes it include every mode of conveying information, from the primitive nod or

wink or gesture, to the imperial Roman postal service. His book comprises a remarkable collection of what may be called the curiosities of intercommunication in the old days of Greece and Rome. No one who has the slightest interest in ancient life can dip into it anywhere without coming upon amusing particulars, which not only form attractive reading in themselves, but often throw interesting sidelights upon history, political as well as social. The

book is not merely an ingathering of material. A number of difficulties are discussed, usually with adequate criticism. Some of them indeed are notorious 'cruces,' which receive illumination here from the setting in which they are found.

One of the largest sections deals with military methods of conveying intelligence, true or intentionally deceptive. A scholar of very wide reading would find it far from easy to think of anything connected with the subject which has been overlooked. Multifarious modes of signalling by sight and sound are minutely examined. The horn, the trumpet, the flag in all its diversities by land and sea, the call in its many applications, the pass-word, the use of signs by fire and smoke, the inscribed leaden sling bullet, the spear with the message tied to it, the attempts at telegraphy, all find a place. Even that peculiar form of impressing an event upon an enemy, which was used by Claudius Nero when he flung Hasdrubal's head into his brother's camp, is illustrated. Particularly striking is the description of endeavours to develop an alphabetic code, connected with fire signals by night and visible indications by day. The author explains how these efforts compare with the Morse code of to-day. It is shown in a remarkable manner how unprogressive the Roman army was in all such matters. It might have learned much not only from the Greeks but from the old Persians.

Another useful section, with a bearing on military history, is given to an inquiry about the pace at which ancient armies were able to march. The journeys of letter carriers are also examined. Much depends here on the letters of Cicero. Herr Riepl seems to have relied entirely on Bardt's *Quaestiones Tullianae*, published in 1866. He would have done well to consult later writers.

The author is constantly on the look out for parallels in the modern world. He has an amusing account of the

tricks of the advertiser. He was a terror in ancient days as now, especially at election times, and the owner of property issued warnings and deprecations addressed to him. But the modern billposter does not attack sepulchral monuments! In this connexion an inscription is given which was discovered at Pompeii only a year or so ago. It is an invocation, to which a group of ladies have appended their names, calling on the public to vote for a particular candidate at the municipal elections.

Dealing with such a mass of material, the author might be pardoned for errors in detail; but very few are discoverable. All references to ancient literature and inscriptions are given in the notes on each page, and many passages are quoted in full. The style is lucid throughout. After reading a few pages of such entertaining matter, one is little disposed to look out for defects. In spite of the broad plan of the work, a few omissions are noticeable here and there. More than once Herr Riepl has occasion to consider the time which news of a change of ruler took to reach the far provinces of the Roman Empire. He does not mention the utility of coins for disseminating intelligence of events connected with the imperial house. The profusion of issues, even when a reign was brief, is in great part to be explained by the convenience of the coin as a means of spreading information in a condensed form. More details might have been given of the practice, inveterate from ancient days, whereby tourists inscribed on monuments memorials of their visits. The Greek soldiers of Psammetichos so scored the stones of Egypt. It will strike many readers that Herr Riepl does not give a clear account of the celebrated 'cursus publicus.' The information is nearly all in his book, but the 'cursus' is dissected, and its various 'disiecta membra' are scattered and disconnected.

J. S. REID.

SHORT NOTICES

Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung. Von HUGO EHRLICH. Cm. 23×15. 1 vol. Pp. xi + 275. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1912. M. 8.

IN this book Dr. Ehrlich has upheld the theory that the Greek accent was predominantly musical, and that the stress accent remained completely in the background until the fourth century B.C. In his defence of this theory he relies chiefly on the argument that, because there are no effects of a stress accent traceable in the reduction of syllables, vowel lengths or consonant groups, the stress accent cannot have been predominant. As I attempted to point out in the case of the accent in classical Latin, this 'argumentum ex silentio' holds good. If, then, Dr. Ehrlich shows that there are no such effects traceable in Greek, he has succeeded in his object. To my mind he has succeeded; and at the same time he has enunciated several principles of considerable importance, and has collected under one head many apparently disconnected phenomena.

In this respect his first chapter is particularly interesting. Dr. Ehrlich has extended the 'Loi rythmique' of Saussure, according to which in Primitive Greek three short syllables could never stand together. He restates it thus: 'Eine Folge von drei kurzen, durch einfache Konsonanz getrennten Vokalen wird beseitigt durch Unterdrückung des Mittleren, wenn dieser im Wortauslaut steht. Dagegen bleibt die Kürze erhalten, wenn sie durch nachfolgende Konsonantengruppe beschwert wird, oder wenn lange Silbe folgt.' From this is explained the existence of the syncopated side by side with the full forms of the prepositions, both as prepositions proper and in verbal and nominal composition; of many dialectal forms; of several stereotyped prepositional and nominal compounds, and case forms like ἐγκάς from *ἐγκασι, *ἐγκη-σι.

Chapter IV. on the 'Lautgesetze des

expiratorischen Akzents im Griechischen,' in which the views put forward by Fick, Sommers, and others as to particular phonetic changes held to be due to a stress accent are combatted, is perhaps not so convincing as the others. The arguments both for and against rely too often on doubtful etymologies. But, as Meillet says, 'pour une étymologie sûre, les dictionnaires en offrent plus de dix qui sont douteuses, et dont en appliquant une méthode rigoureuse on ne saurait faire la preuve.' A discussion of the physiology of the phonetic principles governing these changes would have been valuable. Similarly, when in the last chapter the metrical value of the groups mute+liquid is discussed, a comparison of the Latin and Sanskrit usages might have thrown further light on the question.

But taken as a whole the book is a powerful defence of the existence of a musical accent in Greek; and Thumb is right in regretting that the 'Laut- und Formen-lehre' of the fourth edition of Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik* was already printed when Dr. Ehrlich's book was published.

R. L. TURNER.

Griechische Grammatik, Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre, Syntax. Von Dr. KARL BRUGMANN. Vierte, vermehrte Auflage bearbeitet von Dr. ALBERT THUMB; mit einem Anhang über griechische Lexikographie von Dr. L. COHN. München: Oskar Beck, 1913. Cm. 25×17. 1 vol. Pp. xx+772. Unbound, M. 14.50; bound, M. 16.50.

ALL students of Greek and Comparative Philology will welcome the fourth edition of Brugmann's monumental work. The author, wishing to hold himself free for the completion of the second edition of his *Vergleichende Grammatik*, left the work of preparing this present edition in the hands of Dr. Thumb. Though the main body of the work has been left untouched,

some hundred pages in all have been added. The greatest addition has been made in the department of syntax (52 pages). All references to current literature have been brought up to date (October, 1912); and a distinctive note has been given to the whole—as we might expect from Dr. Thumb's knowledge of the Greek dialects and of Modern Greek—by the emphasis laid upon the continual growth of the language during the Greek period itself, and particularly on the development of classical Greek into the *κοινή*. Further (§ 677 ff.) Dr. Thumb has made some very interesting suggestions—they can scarcely be called more, as he himself admits—concerning a new line of investigation, namely, the question of the musical formation of the Greek sentence.

The appendix on Greek lexicography has been considerably enlarged; but, though it is pleasing to find that the names of Liddell and Scott have at last been given a place among Greek lexicographers, we might expect to see something more than the brief notice, 'In England ist stark verbreitet das Griechisch-Englisch Lexicon von H. G. Liddell und R. Scott.' The discussion of the requisites for a Greek Dictionary is good.

As with the previous editions, this is provided with a full table of contents and excellent indexes; so that it can be consulted at once without annoying delay. As has long been recognised, Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik* is indispensable to the Hellenist; and Dr. Thumb has maintained its reputation.

R. L. TURNER.

The Syrian Goddess, being a translation of Lucian's *De Dea Syria*, with a life of Lucian, by Professor HERBERT A. STRONG, M.A., LL.D., edited with notes and an introduction by JOHN GARSTANG, M.A., D.Sc. Pp. ix + 111, with frontispiece phototype, and 8 figs. in text. Constable & Co., 10, Orange Street, Leicester Square, 1913.

WE welcome Professor Strong's translation of Lucian's *De Syria Dea*, but our welcome would have been twice as

warm had he seen his way to printing the text side by side with the translation. The object of translation is to lead to, not away from, originals. It is, indeed, a little difficult to realise to what class class of readers a translation of this particular treatise by Lucian will appeal. It is purely scientific and the Greek is easy. But a good translation with the text on the opposite leaf is a time-saver that no scholar need scruple to use.

Professor Strong's name is adequate guarantee of the general accuracy of his renderings and his English reads pleasantly without smacking of the construe. But we would plead for a little more caution in the translation of ritual words. We find, for example, *ῥρηγία* rendered 'secret rites.' The rendering is of course canonical, but secrecy is no essential characteristic of *ῥρηγία*; of *μυστήρια* it is, and the distinction should be observed. *καὶ τὰ πένθεα καὶ τὰ ῥρηγία* Professor Strong renders 'the public mourning and the secret rites.' This is not the true antithesis: *πένθεα* are rites of mourning for the dead year or spirit of vegetation; *ῥρηγία* (whatever derivation we accept) are rites, whether secret or public, of resurrection, of bringing in the new life or new year. Hence their *orgiastic* character. This is further emphasised by the verb that characteristically accompanies *ῥρηγία*, *ῥρηγία ἐπιτελέουσι*—they bring to accomplishment or maturity rites of renewal—you do not *ἐπιτελεῖν πένθεα*.

Again in the same section (6) *καταγίζουσι* is rendered 'sacrifice.' This, if *sacrifice* is taken in its primitive etymological sense 'to make sacred or accursed' is correct. But the word 'sacrifice' has to the modern ear more of the colour and flavour of burnt-offering than of scape-goat. *καταγίζουσι* means 'to make over (to the dead) as taboo.' It is again the same antithesis of old and new, of death and life.

Dr. Garstang has added greatly to the value of the book by his introduction on the worship of the Mother-Goddess. It is the worship of this dominant goddess with her young male consort Attis or Adonis or the Kouros, that is the characteristic of the old Anatolian Cretan Hittite religion. It stands always in strong contrast to the worship of father

Zeus with the subordinate Hera, wife rather than mother, which marks the incoming patriarchy of the Indo-European tribes.

J. E. HARRISON.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

Cretan Elements in the Cults and Ritual of Apollo. By MARY HAMILTON SWINDLER, Bryn Mawr College. Bryn Mawr College Monographs: XIII. Dissertation for degree of Doctor of Philosophy. Bryn Mawr, Pennsylvania, 1913.

A CAREFUL and even laborious accumulation of the facts and still more the opinions relating to Cretan elements in the Cult of Apollo. Miss Swindler seems somewhat buried in her sources, but we suppose a doctor's thesis demands exhaustiveness. Her general conclusion is that at an early date Apollo took over into his worship certain Minoan Cults, which 'emanated' from Crete such as those of Smintheus, Delphinios Amyklaios-Hyakinthos, and from Crete he derived the kathartic elements in his worship. But surely 'kathartic' worships are the essence of every cult; half primitive religion in every age and land is riddance katharsis. Occasionally we feel that the sources cited in the Bibliography if read are still undigested. Thus under 'Paeon' Dr. McCurdy's very able article in the *Classical Review* on 'The connection of Paeon with Paeonia' is cited, but to no purpose of either rejection or acceptance. If 'Paeon' is the eponym of the Paeonians the Paeon takes on surely a new and non-Cretan complexion. Miss Swindler's treatise does not advance our knowledge, but it is useful for reference.

J. E. HARRISON.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

STOICS AND SCEPTICS.

Stoics and Sceptics: Four lectures delivered in Oxford during Hilary Term, 1913, for the Common University Fund. By EDWYN BEVAN, sometime Scholar of the New College, Oxford. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " x 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 152. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913. 4s. 6d. net.

THESE brilliant lectures claim to give an 'impressionist sketch' of ancient Stoicism and Scepticism; and they have a further interest, as the work of a pupil of Professor Gilbert Murray, in permitting a glimpse into the attitude of Hellenic Oxford towards the Hellenistic world. Needless to say that there remains some trace of the traditional *de haut en bas* tone towards the work of the later epoch; but we may be grateful for the concession that that epoch has nevertheless a real interest of its own, and deserves more than a passing attention.

Mr. Bevan starts with a sweeping condemnation of one of the most distinguished of his predecessors. 'The worst book upon Stoicism which I know is also German, L. Stein's *Die Psychologie der Stoa*. . . . Those beginning the study of the subject should be warned.' An effective warning must, however, rest on something more than the *ipse dixit* of Mr. Bevan, else the rest of us may continue to be grateful to the philosopher who was the first to treat Stoicism as something more than a decadent variation of the philosophy of Plato and Aristotle. *Hinc illae lacrimae*. After this it is a pleasant surprise to find Mr. Bevan defending against the Academy that part of the Stoic philosophy which is least attractive to the general public. 'Certain truths were, I think, working in [Zeno's theory of knowledge]. It is true, surely, that there must be some things we know in order to make it possible for the problem of knowledge to be raised at all.' On the other hand the monistic basis of the Stoic physics is to Mr. Bevan not merely incredible, but unintelligible. 'To us, the metaphysical grossness of identifying Consciousness, or any element in Consciousness, with a material substance is so obvious that it is difficult for us to transport ourselves into a phase of thought when such confusion was possible.' We must therefore take it that an Oxford audience cannot grasp the attitude which seeks to find a harmony between matter and mind in some ultimate conception which may embrace both; and allowing for this Mr. Bevan states the Stoic position very fairly. With the Stoic ethics he is more com-

pletely out of sympathy; he will have it that Stoicism left no room for the gentler emotions such as affection and sympathy, that the Stoic 'sighs with his stricken friend, but not from the heart.' He therefore omits all reference to the *εὐπάθειαι* (*sapientis affectiones*) and equally ignores the discourses of Epicetus which bear on the natural affections. This is certainly to take an 'impressionist' view of Stoicism which deeper study would remove.

The two concluding lectures deal respectively with Posidonius and the Sceptics. The former he appears to me to characterise correctly, as one who gathered up the current beliefs of his time without having a constructive mind or a distinctive philosophy; and he very happily compares his teaching with that of the modern Encyclopaedia. The sketch of the Sceptics, which concludes the book, is of special interest, as it travels over ground with which few are familiar.

To sum up, '*Stoics and Sceptics*' deserves a warm welcome as a sincere attempt to understand and appreciate the moral forces which dominated the Roman world at the opening of the Christian era, but its adequacy is somewhat impaired by the preconceived views of the author.

E. VERNON ARNOLD.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Paradoxa Stoicorum, Academicorum reliquiae cum Lucullo, Timaeus, De Natura Deorum, De Divinatione, De Fato. Ed. O. PLASBERG. Fasc. II. Pp. 199—399. Leipzig: Teubner, 1911.

THE first volume of this work, containing the *Paradoxa, Academica* and *Timaeus*, appeared in 1908, the second contains the *De Natura Deorum*, the Preface to the whole work is reserved for the third volume.

The criticism of the *De Natura Deorum* was put upon a new footing by the collations of P. Schwenke, published in this Review.¹ These were followed in

1895 by O. Dieckhoff's dissertation,² in which the relations of the MSS. were considered, and it was shown that they fall into two groups, both derived from the same archetype.

It happens, curiously enough, that the three chief MSS. of the superior group, *A*, *B* and *C*, all belong to the Leiden Library. Of these *C*, which is interesting as a specimen of Beneventan script, though otherwise inferior to *A*, with which it is closely connected, has been published in facsimile by Messrs. Sijthoff. The same firm now has *A* in hand. It is to be hoped that *B*, which disputes supremacy with *A* and is extremely interesting on account of some Tironian notes marking omissions, and early attempts to remedy an extensive series of dislocations, may also be thought worthy of publication.

It is somewhat difficult to estimate Plasberg's work without the coming Preface, to which he not infrequently refers. Whereas he collated a large number of new MSS. for the first book of the *Academics*, in the *De Natura Deorum* he confines himself mainly to MSS. collated by Schwenke or J. B. Mayor. For this he probably has good reason, but as the best MSS. are so closely related to each other, and some striking readings are quoted from *deteriores*, these ought to be carefully examined before we acquiesce in the conclusion that all our MSS. are derived from one archetype.

Plasberg's diligence and learning are beyond question, and in his edition the evidence is given more fully than in any previous work. It may be said confidently that he has superseded his predecessors and produced a very valuable book. There are, however, some criticisms which may be made, chiefly on matters of method. In his list of MSS. he does not give the dates. It is somewhat annoying for the reader who has not studied the subject to have to consult other works for information on this point. He is excessively conservative and continually prints corruptions with an asterisk in the margin, or with occasional brackets. Thus in i. 1. he

¹ 1890, pp. 347-355, 400-404, 454-457; 1891, pp. 12-17, 143-146, 200-205, 302-305, 408-412, 458-461.

² *De Ciceronis libris de Natura Deorum recensendis.* Göttingen.

prints *magno argumento esse debeat ea clausa principium philosophiae ad h * * scientiam.*

This is taken from *B*, in which *d* and *h* are inserted by a second hand. In *A* and *C* there is a lacuna extending from *magno argumento . . . enumerare sententias* (§ 2). I would here suggest that *d. h. = deest hic*, a marginal note pointing out a primitive lacuna, which in *B* has been filled up from another source. The omission-symbol has, as is not infrequently the case, been inserted in the text of *B*.

So iii. 1. 2 he gives *tertius est ex Idacis Digitis cui inferias adferunt cui* (with an asterisk).

Surely it is the duty of an editor to make up his mind on such points.

Some very simple corruptions are thought worthy of preservation in brackets, e.g. ii. 100 *ad saxa* [*sa*], a conflation of two variants, *saxa* and *saxosa*; iii. 68 *e regia* [*a*], where *a* is either a variant for *e* or a dittography after the preceding *a*; *ib.* 74 *de fide mala* [*ta*], which apparently comes from a variant *mata* (cf. *Att.* xvi. 13 a. 2 *via mata Z, via mala* edd.). Some orthographical minutiae hardly seem worthy of record, e.g. i. 106 *T[itum] Gracchum*, ii. 9. *rei p. partes* but *r. p. salus*. Such spellings as *i* for *ii*, where the MSS. give *hi*, so *is* for *iis*, seem pedantic.

Plasberg does not seem to lay any stress upon considerations of rhythm. Thus in iii. 22 he prints *conclusio dilatavit potius quam pressit*.

The words in italics are added by him *e coni.* They give a bad *clausula* (Zielinki's *S.* iit^r), while *conclusio dilatavit* (*S.* iii) is normal.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

Queen's College, Oxford.

M. Minucii Felicis Octavius, recognovit
J. P. WALTZING. Leipzig: Teubner,
1912. 1 mark.

THIS dialogue possesses great interest on account of the various problems which it raises. The usual view is that it was written about 160 A.D. If so, it is the earliest work of Christian literature in Latin. Others, e.g. Harnack, are in-

clined to put it into the third century. The question largely depends upon the relation of the *Octavius* to the *Apologeticum* of Tertullian. The resemblances are so great that one author must have borrowed from the other. Minucius, who is said by Lactantius and Jerome to have been a Roman *causidicus*, gives the chief parts in this dialogue to Caecilius, a heathen, and *Octavius*, a Christian. The arguments brought against Paganism are chiefly drawn from Cicero, *De Natura Deorum*, and are very daring, since they might be turned against the miraculous element in Christianity. It is also noticeable that Octavius nowhere asserts the divinity of Christ. The work has come down to us in a single ninth century MS., which has been termed a treasury of corruptions.

The present text is the third which has been published by the firm of Teubner in the last twenty-six years. The first of these proceeded from Bährens in 1886 and exhibits that scholar's gift for infelicitous conjecture. The next editor, H. Böning (1903) was more conservative, and suffered Minucius to write in the language of his own time, instead of removing by emendation all deviations from Ciceronian usage. Waltzing goes further still, and remarks elsewhere '*il faut être plus conservateur encore que Boenig et sacrifier un plus grand nombre de conjectures.*'¹

The apparatus given under the text in this edition chiefly consists of MS. readings, including orthographical peculiarities. It may be questioned whether the editor has not been too chary in mentioning conjectures. He also gives a very useful list of parallel passages in other authors. The introduction is very scanty and contains no discussion of the date or subject-matter. This omission is due to the fact that Waltzing has already treated all such points elsewhere, viz. in his edition of the author with explanatory notes (1903), and in admirable articles published in the *Musée Belge*. In the first of these (1902, pp. 216-261) he gives a complete account of the bibliography from 1543 downwards; and in the second (1906, pp. 245-286) he discusses the text, the

¹ *Musée Belge*, 1906, p. 245.

work and the life of the author. In the latter article he examines Harnack's theory of the date in a judicial spirit, stating carefully the arguments on both sides. His own conclusion is in favour of the traditional view.

The prose of Minucius is highly metrical in character, as was shown by W. Meyer and Norden. The new science of prose-rhythm has proved, as Zielinski says, a 'divine judgment' for many emendations, and particularly those of Bährens. Waltzing refers on various occasions to a paper of Winterfeld on passages in Minucius, where the *numerus* casts light on the text, and has made some contributions of his own. The method which he follows is that of the French school. Some of his remarks are puzzling, and I venture to think his treatment of the question somewhat superficial. This is the only blot visible in this excellent edition.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

Queen's College, Oxford.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. LV. S. Hieronymi Epistolae II. Ed. I. HILBERG. 8vo. Pp. 516. Vienna: Tempsky, 1912. M. 16.

PROFESSOR HILBERG of Czernowitz is making good progress with his edition of St. Jerome's Epistles, and he promises the third and final volume, with prolegomena and indices, in 1914. Till then it is difficult to say much about his work. There is a MS. at Lyons of the sixth century, but Jerome was such a favourite with monks of the Caroline era that there is also an abundance of MSS. of the ninth, many of which are in North Italy, where Vallarsi, the excellent editor of the eighteenth century, made good use of them. Jerome, in fact, is one of the Fathers who have least needed re-editing, though his works are an unexhausted quarry of many kinds of knowledge. His letters are often letters only in name; many are short critical or exegetical treatises, and some are controversial. But this volume contains two documents of great general interest, the funeral sermon on Paula, which somehow has drifted

among the letters, and his epistle of advice to that lady on the education of her daughter Laeta, who was to be brought up as a consecrated virgin. In the latter comes the famous picture of the child at her Christian devotions on the knee of her pagan grandfather, Albinus. And both are full of the pride of birth in the last days of ancient Rome. Paula by her mother descends from Scipios and Gracchi, her husband from Aeneas and the Julii, her father from all that is noble in ancient Greece, and especially from Agamemnon.

E. W. WATSON.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. LIX. S. Hieronymi in Hieremian, Libri Sex. Ed. S. REITER. Pp. cxxv+576. Vienna: Tempsky, 1913. M. 16.

PROFESSOR REITER of Prague has treated this, the latest work of Jerome, as a whole, with prolegomena and indices. This unfinished commentary is an astonishing work for a man of eighty. He was so familiar with his subject, and had so thoroughly perfected his method, that he could almost automatically produce work of uniform quality. But he retained to the last the vigour, not to say the brutality, of his controversial manner. It is here that he describes Pelagius as 'Scottorum pultibus praegravatus,' and speaks of the school of his rival Rufinus as 'Grunniana familia.' The importance of the volume lies chiefly in the Biblical text for which it is an evidence, and to this topic the editor devotes almost half of his prolegomena. It shows how freely Jerome treated his own Vulgate text, which was already becoming authoritative in the Latin-speaking world, and how, when he is comparing his version from the Hebrew with the meaning of the LXX, he employs for the latter that Old Latin which uniformly appears in citations from Tertullian down to Hilary of Poitiers. As is usual with Jerome, MSS. are good. At their head stands one which is partly at Lyons, partly at Paris and partly lost. It dates from the sixth century, and Reiter devotes twenty

pages to its examination, after the manner of Traube, though he does not assign it a country of origin. Perhaps a clue may be found in the Oxford Laudian MS. from Lorch, which is a direct copy from it of the ninth or tenth century. Dr. Reiter is evidently a sound scholar, but few of us would dare to say as he does in regard to the Lyons MS.: 'Totum codicem a capite usque ad calcem ad amussim ita examinavi, ut ne in minutiis quidem me peccasse spondeam et, si quis librum L. adire voluerit, vix quicquam quod neglexerim eum inventurum esse confidam.'

E. W. WATSON.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Commenti Donatiani ad Terenti Fabulas Scholia Gemina et Spuria probabiliter separare conatus est H. T. KARSTEN. Volumen II. 8vo. Pp. xix + 349. Lugduni Batavorum: A. W. Sijthoff, 1913. M. 5.

THIS is the second volume of Mr. Karsten's edition of the Scholia of the *Commentary of Donatus* on the plays of Terence, the first volume of which was noticed in the *Classical Review* a short time since. The first volume contained the Scholia on the *Andria* and the *Eunuchus*; the present volume contains the Scholia on the remaining plays—namely, the *Adelphoe*, the *Hecyra*, and the *Phormio*—the Scholia on the *Heautontimorumenos* being lost.

Most of what was said in the *Review* of the former volume with regard to the character and the value of Mr. Karsten's work holds good also with regard to the present volume. He follows the same general principles as in the earlier volume, and applies them with the same careful judgment. There is, however, a difference between the two volumes in the character of the Scholia they respectively contain. The Scholia on the three plays in the present volume are proportionally fewer in number than those in the previous volume, and those that have to be rejected as spurious in accordance with the principles laid down by Mr. Karsten in his first volume are not only relatively but absolutely fewer than in

Vol. I. In fact in Vol. I. the spurious Scholia form 33 per cent. of the whole, while in Vol. II. they amount only to 17 per cent. Mr. Karsten also remarks that the Scholia of the second volume are distinguished by a simplicity and an absence of confusion that greatly facilitated the editor's work.

It would be interesting to know if a definite reason could be assigned for this difference between the notes on the two groups of plays. It is not improbable that some light might be thrown on the matter if the origin of the Scholia as we have them could be ascertained. This question, however, is as yet by no means settled, despite the attention Mr. Karsten has given to it.

The volume now before us contains a list of a considerable number of corrigenda in Vol. I. as well as in Vol. II., and ends with a useful index covering the contents of both volumes.

C. H. KEENE.

University College, Cork.

CESARE GIARRATANO: *I codici dei libri De re coquinaria di Celio*. pp. 18. Naples: Detken and Rocholl.

THIS useful little piece of the work is the first methodical attempt to estimate the values of the various MSS. in which the *De re coquinaria* is contained: Schuch (Heidelberg 1867 and 1874) had obtained collations—often imperfect and incorrect—but had made no serious attempt to classify the tradition. It has long been known that the book is not the work of the famous gourmet M. Apicius of Tiberius' time: indeed, as Teuffel (*Gesch. der röm. Lit.*, 6 edn. 1910. ii., p. 209) pointed out, 'Apicius' is naturally a name to give to such a book of recipes, as Cicero gave the name of 'Laelius' to his treatise on friendship: but it is nevertheless of great value for the study of the gastronomy of later Imperial times. Schanz in the second edition of his *Gesch. der röm. Lit.* (II. 2. p. 394) had remarked that 'die Ueberlieferung des Kochbuchs des Caelius ist noch nicht methodisch geprüft': the work has here been done, and well done, and Giarra-

tano's results are now included in Schanz's third edition (1913. II. 2. p. 507).

S. GASELEE.

Magdalene College, Cambridge.

Statii Achilleis. Interpretatus est M. R. J. BRINGREVE. Brusse, Rotterdam, 1913.

It is to be feared that this book is not of great merit. I could have wished to speak kindly of it, since it is written by a pupil of Professor Damsté—whose work is well known in this country—and because, like other work by young Dutch scholars, it proceeds from a genuine enthusiasm. But the editor is clearly not adequately equipped for an undertaking of this compass. He writes throughout in Latin, no doubt of necessity. Yet he ought not, in his Prefaces, to offer the reader such a solecism as *fauvit*, for *favit*, nor to employ the strange word *promotor* (nor yet, perhaps, the form *poeseos*). At i. 72 he ought to know that *haut permitte* ('don't allow') is not Latin. At i. 152 he ought at any rate to think twice about the quantity *Pharsäliae*. At i. 552,

aut verum penitus latet et sine Apolline Calchas

he ought not to say that *aut verum* is = *sin minus*. He takes the line to mean 'Otherwise Achilles is completely hidden and Calchas is uninspired!' It means, of course, 'or else the truth is completely hidden, etc.' At i. 763 he ought to have known that *extemplo* means 'for a moment' 'just at first.' At ii. 129 he should probably not have rendered *vicina pube* by 'cum pubertas appropinquaret': it seems to mean simply 'the young men around me.' There is

a good deal else of a character rather doubtful: e.g., the note at i. 55 on the termination-*osus*; the interpretation at i. 136 of the difficult *sub axe peracto*: the defence of the genitive *anhela metus* ('panting from fear') at i. 488; the absurd comment '*iustus: ἀπὸ κοινοῦ* ad *movebis* et ad *recludes* pertinet' at i. 498; the defence of *hasta* (nothing is said of the impossible rhythmical break) at i. 723: the gratuitous *auro* at i. 756 (we are not even told where it comes from: certainly none of Brinkgreve's MS. reads it): the incongruity of the note on i. 883 where the phrase '*Hec-tora poscens*,' 'challenging Hector to battle,' is said to be a metaphor from the wine-clubs '*ubi pocula poscebant*'!

I should not call attention to these faults if this book as a whole had redeeming merits. But it has not. Half the notes in it are of a character so trivial and elementary that they were not worth writing; and it does not seem to me that the real difficulties are either solved or seen.

The edition does not pretend to be critical: and since it agrees with my own on the only two points of principle upon which it differs from Klotz (the valuation of the MSS. *E* and *C*), I would not wish to complain of it. Yet the reader ought to have been told that for i. 529-661 *K* and *Q* (after *P* our best MSS.) are wanting:¹ and at i. 239 Postgate's emendation, *tenuior*, which I have always thought certain, at least deserved notice. The editor offers only one conjecture of his own, *iniectatque* at 326, for which there is something to be said.

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College, Oxford.

¹ The lacuna is filled in by a late hand.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SOME WORKS ON SYNTAX—A
REPLY.

IN the *Classical Review* for December, 1913, there appears an amusing review in which an attack is made first of all on a number of 'opuscula produced by modern scholars' on the

subject of syntax, and secondly upon the established principles of modern grammar as associated with the study of psychology. I venture to take advantage of the opportunity given me for a reply, not because I question the advantages of ridicule in repressing the eccentricities of individuals, but because silence might easily be interpreted as an abandonment of the whole

case for scientific grammar, the strength of which is very inadequately appreciated by many even amongst professed classical scholars.

On the subject of 'would-be Doctor's theses' very little need be said, because in other subjects as well there are doctoral theses which are not widely read, and which betray defects of style or immaturity of thought. But theses deserve to be kindly treated, first because they are mostly distributed at the writers' expense, and secondly because those that are bad presumably reveal some weakness in the University teaching which has helped them to the birth. And why be severe with these students' theses, when the grammatical teaching of the text-books issued by our University Presses teems with distorted facts, perverse arrangement, and illogical discourse? With the 'adverbial accusatives,' 'vivid subjunctives,' and constantly disappointed 'expectations' of the ordinary school-books we need not fear to compare the essay of Rudolf Frobenius on the *Syntax of Ennius* (1910), which is an admirable contribution not only to Latin grammar but also to the criticism of the text of an important author: and I believe there are numerous studies of single authors which deserve equal praise. Their critic says that these essays start with statements with which every one agrees, and use a terminology which is needlessly elaborate. I shall, however, endeavour to show that the correct statement of familiar facts is a matter of real importance, whilst all sciences find the need of a special terminology which is not easily appreciated by the layman. The critic's case, I think, is not improved by his extending the attack to the whole science of modern medicine.

To pass to the more important attack on the principles of modern scientific grammar, which are considered to be unintelligible and unpopular, I may perhaps refer first to my own experience of more than thirty years ago. Then I remember that these very principles were expounded by the late Dr. Peile to audiences for which the lecture-rooms of his own college were too small, and I can testify that his hearers were both interested and convinced. Our critic, however, as an 'ordinary man,' knows that 'every verb should have a subject, and every subject a verb; once there, he is at the bedrock of grammar and is content to go no further.'¹ Here he certainly seems to be turning the laugh against himself, for we could hardly find a better description of the obscurantist temperament as displayed towards every department of science. Let us, however, test the value of the little knowledge which is still to be spared to us.

And first let us notice that the above statement is not the discovery of the 'ordinary man,' but merely a fragment of rather obsolete grammar as formulated by philosophers. If we are really to go back to the Deluge and the nursery to find the 'bedrock of grammar,' we must notice that neither Methuselah of old nor our nurselings of to-day have any understanding of

verbs. The author of *Genesis* states that Adam 'gave names to all cattle, and to all the fowl of the air, and to every beast of the field'; and, similarly, Lucretius states that in early ages 'utilitas expressit nomina rerum.' The nursery, too, understands this much; but in the line of our civilisation it is the Greek philosophers who first distinguished the 'noun' from the 'verb,' and realised the importance of the latter. It was a great step forward, but is neither the beginning nor the end of grammar. The crude statement that every sentence is built upon the association of subject and verb ignores such characteristic sentences in Latin as *uac misero mihi, acriter pugnatum est, paenitet me facti, neque is teli auctor*: and it is very inadequate in even such combinations as *pater filium laudat*, in which the object is quite as essential a feature as subject and verb.

But the statement is as imperfect in its reasoning as in its facts. For whence should come this 'bedrock' principle? Is it founded on some natural necessity of reasoning, or on an arbitrary decision of the Creator? Both hypotheses are equally repugnant to modern habits of thought, and equally barren of practical results. The forms of thought and speech appear to us to-day as the results of the experimenting activity of the human mind, and as such are infinitely varied and continually changing; and the definition given by Wundt, if treated as a summary of his careful exposition of the subject, will (I think) be found to be of real value: and at least it deserves consideration as the suggestion of so distinguished a philosopher.

In the *Classical Review* for December, 1901, I had the privilege of giving an account of Wundt's book *Die Sprache*, which is a part of the series on *Völkerpsychologie*; and I may perhaps refer my readers to my article as a fuller statement of the position than I can now make. I think they will find that the psychology of speech is neither dull nor unintelligible. Here I can only venture to quote a short passage which will indicate what kind of 'bedrock' principles modern science can find for the forms of speech, and to trace very shortly the argument by which Wundt reaches the definition which our best modern grammars borrow from him.

Speech in this theory is a by-product of the human emotions and their reflex action on the nervous system. In its lower forms of gesture and gesture-language it is common to man with the lower animals: in its higher forms as picture-language, word-language, and (in mathematics) symbol-language it is peculiar to man. The first upward step is taken as follows:

'A child in low spirits cries. On another occasion it sees its mother cry; this depresses its spirits, and it cries too. After repeating both experiences many times, it becomes conscious of tears as a sign of low spirits. Next day, being in rather low spirits, it cries purposely to indicate its low spirits to its mother. The tears are no longer gesture, but gesture-language.'

In picture-language a further step is taken. When a Red Indian recalls to his neighbour a particular man by a drawing which consists of half a dozen straight lines, he represents what

¹ The italics are mine.

is to both of them a complete whole by a series of descriptive parts. It is a primitive analysis. The representation may be very inexact, but it suffices for its purpose, and the principle is exactly the same as that employed by the most accomplished etcher. In the picture there is an assemblage of details; but the onlooker sums them up and by a mental effort reunites them to construct the whole from which they were first drawn. Such, too, is the first and every later word-sentence. The speaker represents a single thought by two or more words; the hearer, at the suggestion of these words, reconstructs in his mind the original thought. The sentence is the unit, the word the fraction. But the fractions or parts are throughout connected by grammatical relations, upon which all processes of reason are ultimately based. The grammatical relations are at first very varied, and the speaker may make choice of many forms to express the same meaning; but in the later stages of speech a few grammatical types become predominant, and the remainder rapidly decay and pass out of use.

This is the doctrine which Wundt has compressed into the short definition which may be translated as follows:

'The unit of human speech is the *Sentence*. By it that which is to speaker and hearer a single mental picture is represented (by an exercise of the human will which makes selection from several possible types) by two or more spoken words. The relations between these "words" or parts of the sentence are treated of in the sciences of grammar and logic.

We have gained a good deal. First, a definition which covers every sentence, and covers it completely. Secondly, the founding of grammar on observed facts, not on imaginary first principles. Thirdly, the principle that in translating we must start from sentences, not from words. Lastly (not least), the warning that words are always an inadequate representation of thought, and that logic shares their weakness and always falls short of a true representation of things.

How practical these gains are may be seen from examples that the critic suggests. *Quia*, he says (and so, I suppose, *quod* too) is roughly equivalent to 'because.' So our schoolboys are taught, and accordingly translate *laudo quia venisti*—'I praise you because you have come,' *accusat quod fugerit*—'he blames him because he fled.' To arrive at the true translations: 'Many thanks to you for coming,' 'he accuses him of having run away,' he must throw away

his rough tools, and use the better implements now available.

Our critic next discusses the principles of sentence combination, which appear to be treated quite correctly by the thesis-writers, though possibly with unnecessary elaboration and a rather polysyllabic terminology. These things, the critic says, every one knows, and they are common to all writers. But in fact there is great variation, and the pupil who can translate *Roma profectus Gades contendit* by 'he left Rome and proceeded to Gades' has already learned to appreciate the main difference between Latin and English narrative style. The theory admits considerable controversy. The 'ordinary man,' not without countenance from the Joint Committee on Grammatical Terminology, classifies subordinate clauses as substantial, adjectival, and adverbial; that is, he explains composition by the laws of analysis. This I believe to be an error in principle; and, at any rate, it is not unimportant to notice that it is a comparatively recent innovation, having been introduced by A. Herling, under the influence of the German psychologists of the day, in the year 1821. An interesting discussion of the point will be found in Messrs. Clark and Ungood's recent grammar *English*.

The critic is moved by a real ardour for popularising the classics, and in his heart he seems to be anxious to abolish grammar altogether. For this there is something to be said, and certainly modern languages are often well learnt by a 'direct method' in which grammar hardly finds a place. Nevertheless I believe that the teaching of Latin in our schools requires grammar as an essential feature, and there is really nothing substantial to be urged for a conventional grammar any more than for a conventional pronunciation. The present rebellion against grammar is due to the fact that in practice it is found to be in so many ways inaccurate and insufficient. The remedy is in introducing up-to-date grammar, scientific in its principles and precise in its details: and the country which has produced a Kennedy and a Roby should not despair of accomplishing some day this task. The psychologists and the thesis-writers already deserve the credit of pioneers in this direction.

EDWARD V. ARNOLD.

[Readers who turn to the review in question (*Cl. Rev.* xxvii. 266) may perhaps think that it hardly merits so formidable an indictment.—ED.]

NOTES AND NEWS

A CORRESPONDENT writes: 'Performances of the *Acharnians* were given in Oxford for a week in February to large and appreciative houses. The burden of training the actors was borne by Mr. C. Bailey, Fellow of Balliol, who has

had great experience in presenting Aristophanes to Oxford audiences, and all agree that actors and chorus played their parts admirably, with spirit and intelligence. The leading character of Dikaïopolis was taken by Mr. Llewellyn

Jones, of Magdalen, one of the best in a good company, who kept the play from flagging, and the music, a clever adaptation of popular airs, was written by the Choragus of the University, Sir Hubert Parry, "Parrys-tophanes," as a wit termed him. Of course many of the comic effects were given in ways which do not appear in the text of Aristophanes, but that must be done in any presentation of an ancient comedy in these days; thus, some of the audience must have remembered the performance of the Frogs, and the inimitable scene of "coaching the boat" in which Charon took his passengers across the Styx. Such devices, such "fertility of invention," as was said on the last night, were especially necessary in this play, in which the connexion of some of the episodes, for instance, the appearance of Euripides and that of Nicarchus, though *φωνᾶντα συνετοῖσι*, are not at once apparent to a modern audience. The actors had been trained to bring out the points of the language (a thing constantly neglected by modern actors of Shakespeare's comedies), and for exquisite wit and brilliance of style few comedies surpass this, the earliest extant play by the greatest master of exuberant imagination and audacious ingenuity. The Greek Play Committee are to be heartily congratulated on their success.

Mr. Ettore Romagnoli, a scholar who has also a taste for the theatre, is organising a performance of the *Persae* of Aeschylus for Easter next (April 16 and 19, 1914). The acting edition will be his own translation of the play, and it will be performed in the Greek theatre of Syracuse, for the first time no doubt since the author was there. Mr. Romagnoli has already superintended a performance of the Bacchants in Fiesole, using his own translation.

Professor Gildersleeve, writing in the current number of the *American Journal of Philology*, pays an interesting tribute to the memory of Robinson Ellis. After enumerating Ellis's contributions to the Journal, the Professor records his impressions of a visit to Oxford in 1880.

'Of the classical men' (he writes)

'whom I met during that summer Robinson Ellis gave me the most cordial welcome, showed the deepest interest in my project, and proved to be the most conspicuous and steadfast contributor to the work that has absorbed so much of my time and energy. After my return we exchanged letters from time to time until of late years, when his eyes failed, and he ceased to send me those marvellous specimens of chirography, which by reason of the minuteness and intricacy of the characters were as perilous to the eyesight of others as his incessant reading of manuscripts had been to his own. A man who would illustrate a Latin commentary by a reference to Brer Rabbit cannot be said to have been out of touch with our times, and yet I have always felt as if I had been privileged to know one of the great scholars of the past, with their bewildering wealth of first-hand knowledge and their immediate vision. His interpretation often seemed to be fanciful, his conjectures too acute to be convincing, but the massiveness and the genuineness of his learning held my critical temper in check: and I shall cherish the memory of his friendship as a precious possession. Two visions of my kind host, my sympathetic correspondent, abide in my chamber of imagery. One as he sat in his rooms poring over a yellow parchment MS. lighted by two candles. No figure more like one of the pictures of those large-limbed scholars of the old days whom he delighted to honour. "A book-worm, a candle-waster" he would have been called by the wits of the spacious times of great Elizabeth, to which he seemed to belong. The other as he stood in a pouring rain, over against the Sheldonian Theatre at Oxford, and recited to me pages of Petronius, not contained in the *Cena Trimalchionis* of the *Satyricon*. His last lecture was on the *Amores* of Ovid. Vast, varied, and vivid was his knowledge of those ranges of antique life and literature, and he would not have disclaimed the association of his name with that of Peter Burmann.'

On Friday, February 20, Mr. T. E. Peet read a paper dealing with the

question 'Who were the Romans?' to the Oxford Philological Society. Mr. Peet's arguments may be summarised as follows:

The mixture of inhumations and cremations among the burials discovered since 1902 in the Roman Forum, and in earlier years elsewhere on the site of the city, suggest that Mommsen was ill-advised in his dictum that the Romans were not a mixed people, for in Italy this difference of funeral rite is clearly indicative throughout of the presence of two entirely different races. In neolithic times the country was inhabited by a long-headed race who inhumed their dead and who lived in caves or semi-subterranean huts. At the opening of the bronze age there appeared in North Italy a new race, who cremated their dead, and who lived on pile dwellings, at first in the lakes but afterwards on the marshy ground south of the Po (*terremare*). At the end of the bronze age, according to the most widely accepted opinion, numbers of these people crossed the Apennines and settled in Latium and Tuscany, and to them the earliest cremation cemeteries of those districts are to be attributed. They did not however exterminate the original neolithic inhabitants, who lived side by side with them, still continuing to practise their old rite of inhumation. The mixture of these two elements, the

dolichocephalic people of the neolithic period (Ibero-Liguri) and the probably brachycephalic folk of the lake dwellings and *terremare* (the Italic of Pigorini), formed the Roman nation, and it is not improbable that in this difference of race lies the origin of the bitter struggles of patricians and plebeians, the latter representing the Iberian-Ligurian element and the former the Italic. The presence of a strong admixture of *terremare* folk in the Roman people is proved not only by the prevalence of cremation, but also by a number of remarkable resemblances, even in small details, between the Roman camp and the *terramara* with its four-sided form, its *arx* or *templum*, its single wooden bridge, its *cardo* and *decumanus*, its rampart and moat, its sacred furrow (*sulcus*) and its ritual pits.

Messrs. Macmillan and Co. hope to publish during the coming autumn a new and enlarged edition of Tsountas and Manatt's volume on *The Mycenaean Age*. Professor Tsountas will contribute a new chapter on Pre-Mycenaean Archaeology, while Dr. George Karo, Director of the German Institute at Athens, will contribute a substantial chapter on Crete. Any scholar who has noted errata in the original text is invited to communicate with Professor Manatt at Brown University, Providence, Rhode Island, U.S.A.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

*** Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Ballley (E. J.) A Course of Practical English. 7½" × 5". Pp. viii + 182. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914. Cloth, 1s. 6d.

Bury (J. B.) A History of Greece (New Edition). 7½" × 5". Pp. xxv + 909. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. Cloth, 8s. 6d.

Caesar (De Bello Gallico) Erster Band, 17te Auflage, von H. Meusel. Mit einer Karte von Gallien und drei Plänen. 8" × 5". Pp. viii + 464. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 4.60.

Cauer (P.) Palaestra Vitae. Das Altertum als Quelle praktischer Geistesbildung, 3te Auflage. 8¼" × 5½". Pp. xii + 182. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. Cloth, M. 4.

Dieterich (A.) Nekuia. Beiträge zur Erklärung der neuentdeckten Petrusapokalypse. 2te Auflage. 8½" × 5¾". Pp. xvi + 238. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 6.

Ernout (A.) Morphologie Historique du Latin. 6¾" × 4¾". Pp. xiv + 368. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1914. Cloth, Fr. 3.50.

- Euripides* (Iphigenia in Tauris) Abridged by T. S. Morton. 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 4". Pp. viii+48+xxix. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914. Cloth, 1s. 6d.
- Fiske* (G. C.) Lucilius, the Ars Poetica of Horace, and Persius. Harvard Studies in Classical Philology, Vol. XXIV. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 6". Pp. 36. 1913.
- Gercke* (A.) Die Entstehung der Aeneis. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 6". Pp. viii+205. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 5.
- Gercke* (A.) und *Norden* (E.) Einleitung in die Altertumswissenschaft, III Band. 10" $\times$ 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. viii+500. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 10.
- Giles* (A. F.) A History of Rome (People's Books). 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 96. London: T. C. and E. C. Jack, 1914. Cloth, 6d. net.
- Gronau* (K.) Poseidonios und die Jüdisch-Christliche Genesisexegese. 9" $\times$ 6". Pp. viii+313. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 12.
- Holmes* (T. R.) Caesar de Bello Gallico. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. lxi+462. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Cloth, 8s. 6d. net.
- Κουγέα. ὁ Καίσαρ εἰς τὴν ἱστορίαν τῆς πρώτης ἀναγεννήσεως τῶν ἐλληνικῶν γραμμάτων ἐν Βυζαντίῳ. 9" $\times$ 6". Pp. 152. Ἐν Ἀθήναις· βιβλιοπωλεῖον Ἐλευθερουδάκη καὶ Μπάρτ, 1913. Dr. 5.
- Λαογραφία. Δελτίον τῆς ἐλληνικῆς λαογραφικῆς ἐταιρείας. Τόμος Δ' τεύχος α', β'. 9" $\times$ 6". Ἐν Ἀθήναις· τόποις 17. Δ. Σακελλαρίου, 1913.
- Laum* (B.) Stiftungen in der Griechischen und Römischen Antike: ein Beitrag zur antiken Kulturgeschichte. Erster Band: Darstellung, pp. x+255. Zweiter Band: Urkunden, pp. viii+224. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 18 per vol.
- Livy* (Book XXVII.) Edited by S. G. Campbell. (Pitt Press Series.) 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xxviii+218. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 3s.
- Loeb Classical Library.* Horace, Odes and Epodes (C. E. Bennett), pp. xx+431. Cicero, De Officiis (W. Miller), pp. xvi+425. Suetonius (J. C. Rolfe), Vol. I., pp. xxxii+500. Julian (W. C. Wright), Vol. II., pp. 520. Dio's Roman History (E. Cary), Vol. I., pp. xxviii+449. 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". London: W. Heinemann, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net per vol.
- Mavignia* (A.) L'Attività Artistica di Lisippo. 9" $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 118. Rome: E. Loescher, 1914. L. 5.
- Mommsen* (T.) Gesammelte Schriften. Achter Band. Epigraphische und numismatische Schriften (Erster Band). 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. x+626. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 18.
- Ostia.* Cenni Storici e Guida. 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii+150. Rome: E. Loescher, 1914. L. 4.
- Pecs* (W.) Συγκριτική τροπική τῆς ποιήσεως τῶν ἐγκρίτων χρόνων τῆς ἐλληνικῆς λογοτεχνίας. οἱ τρόποι τῆς Ἰλιάδος καὶ Ὀδυσσεύς, τοῦ Πινδάρου, Αἰσχύλου, Σοφοκλέους, Εὐριπίδου καὶ Ἀριστοφάνους. 8" $\times$ 5". Pp. 400. Buda-Pesth, 1914. Kor. 8.
- Robinson* (H. B.) Syntax of the Participle in the Apostolic Fathers. 10" $\times$ 7". Pp. 45. Chicago: University Press; and Cambridge: University Press, 1914. 2s. net.
- Rothe* (K.) Die Odyssee als Dichtung, und ihr Verhältniss zur Ilias. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6". Pp. x+360. Paderborn: Schöningh, 1914. M. 5.40; cloth, M. 6.40.
- Sikes* (E. E.) The Anthropology of the Greeks. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5". Pp. xii+112. London: D. Nutt, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Sophocles* (in English Verse) Part II.: Aias, Electra, Trachinian Maidens, Philoctetes. By A. S. Way. 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 5". Pp. 276. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Strenger* (F.) Strabos Erdkunde von Libyen. (Quellen und Forschungen, Heft 28.) 10" $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii+140. Berlin: Weidmann, 1913. M. 5.
- Thucydides* (Book VI.) Edited by C. F. Smith (College Series of Greek Authors). 8" $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. xiv+250. London: Ginn and Co., 1914. Cloth, 6s. 6d.
- Tyrrell* (R. Y.) The Acharnians of Aristophanes. With a Translation into English Verse. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5". Pp. 83. Oxford: University Press, 1914. 1s. net.
- Usener* (H.) Kleine Schriften. Dritter Band. 9" $\times$ 6". Pp. vi+546. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 24.
- von Christ* (W.) Geschichte der Griechischen Litteratur. Zweite Hälfte von 100 bis 530 nach Christus. 10" $\times$ 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xii+507-1320. München: C. H. Beck, 1913. M. 14.50.
- Wallis* (J. E. W.) A First English Grammar. 7" $\times$ 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. viii+80. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914. Cloth, 1s.

The Classical Review

MAY, 1914

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE NEW LYRIC FRAGMENTS.—I.

THE addition of more than two hundred lines to the scanty remains of Lesbian poetry is a feat of which Messrs. Grenfell and Hunt may well be proud.¹ Their able editing we now take as a matter of course; but when they calmly tell us that a fragment which consists of 37 lines has been built up of some twenty small pieces chosen from a heap of no less than fifty-six, we want to take off our hats to their scholarly devotion. My only regret is that they have not thought fit to give their readers more photographs. For it is only by careful reconstitution by means of letter-tracing that some of the more mutilated fragments can be won back from the limbo of palaeography to the living world of literature. In the present paper I shall deal chiefly with the less mutilated pieces.

(a) SAPPHO.

The fine poem of Sappho in Column I of the 1st Fragment of Papyrus 1231, presents difficulties which can only be got over by reconstructing the MS. The first thing is to determine the position and nature of the line of the initial letters. Its position can be got by tracing-in the quite certain beginnings of ll. 1 and 18,² its nature by tracing—so far as they are available—the initial

letters of the mutilated Col. ii. The latter process shows that the initial line in Col. i. may be very slightly serpentine instead of perpendicular, but it does not zigzag. We can now trace out any suggested filling of the gap and see if it fits, remembering, of course, that the first two or three letters tend to be rather large and the last few letters of the longer lines rather small, and the space between any given pair of letters, though nearly always, is not quite always, the same.

The key to the situation lies in ll. 15-17. In the first place, in a personal poem of this kind we expect a vocative; for it was the ancient custom to put the name of the person addressed, not into the title, but into the poem itself. I take 'Ανακτορία then as vocative. The word μέμνα (glossed by μέμναι) I regard as certain. It might be either imperative for μέμνᾶσο or indicative for μέμνᾶσαι. The gloss is in favour of the latter, but of this presently. The letter before μέμνα is beyond all doubt ν. In line 16 the Papyrus certainly has παρείοιςας and not ἀπειόιςας. The word before this cannot be οὐ, which would involve hiatus between the 3rd and 4th lines of a Sapphic stanza. There is not room for μη, μω, μου, or μων. The object therefore of μέμνα is a person who, at the time at which the action of μέμνα takes place, is present and not absent; and this person is not the

¹ *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*, Part X. 1914.

² These numbers are those of the lines of the poem, not of the column.

writer, but a third person, who, since she is not expressed as an object to μέμνα in ll. 15 and 16, may reasonably be looked for as an unexpressed antecedent of a following relative-sentence. Does the following sentence admit of reconstitution as a relative-sentence? I can only say that τᾶς fits the gap exactly. (Βολλοίμαν requires κε; the τε of the Papyrus, as the editors have seen, must be a mistake for κε by anticipation of the τε which comes later in the line.)

We have now to decide the beginning of l. 15. It obviously must connect the story of Helen (ll. 6-13) and its moral (ll. 13-14), with Anactoria. Nothing seems possible but οὐδέ or μηδέ. To say 'Don't remember a person when she is present' is absurd. I decide, therefore, for οὐδέ. The person παρειούσας is now seen to be parallel to Helen's παῖς and φίλοι τόκες; and all we need further is a parallel to a poem in which Sappho speaks of the love of one of her friends for another. This we have in one of the Berlin Fragments (my N.F. 4).

In l. 8 the Papyrus must have had κρίνεν not κρίνεν,¹ and in l. 10 κούδέ, not κωυδέ which is too long nor οὐδέ which is too short.² For l. 11 οὐδεν, οὔκετ', τόσσον, πλείον (or πλήον), are all too short. For l. 13 Κύπρις is far too long; it is also too long if one thinks of reading in l. 12 Κύπρις ἔραισαν (or ἔρασαν or ἔρωσαν). In l. 14 we should at first sight have expected πάρεον, but πάρον might (through πάρρον) represent πάριον or πάριον which is the form Aeolic would be expected to show; cf. such forms as χρυσοτέρα (i.e., χρυσιότερα) Sa. 123, ἴσος 2 and ἴσος 91, τέλεσον and τέλεσσαι 1, περάτων Alc. 34 and περράτων 84. In l. 16 for δῆ see L. and S. s.v. II. 2. In l. 20 ἵππομάχεντας is quite certainly too short, and moreover, if it had been there we should have had ὄπλοισιν not ὄπλοισι. I have no doubt that πειδομάχεντας—suggested to me by Mr. Rackham—is right. In l. 22 πάντ', ταῦτ', τοῦτ', are all too short. The word I have given, λῶιστ', is the only suitable one I can think of

which will fit. In the same line the last two words are enough, now that we know the general trend of the poem, to form a basis for reconstructing the rest of the stanza. Line 22 was clearly the last of the column. It is uncertain if Column i. is complete in the number of lines. But it is worth while pointing out that if so, six lines, or a stanza and a half, would just complete the upper end of Column ii, leaving us the alternatives, first of supposing the poem to have consisted of seven stanzas, and secondly of supposing it to have ended with the sixth stanza, and to have been followed by a poem consisting of a single stanza—which is perhaps unlikely. If this poem was seven stanzas long its last line was the first extant line of Column ii.—

τ' ἔξ ἀδοκίητω.

It is rather unlike the ancient practice to leave a mentioned person unnamed. I am inclined, therefore, in any case to imagine that the poem did not end with the sixth stanza, but extended to at least one more which contained the name of the third woman.

A few words by way of introduction to the poem. It gives point to the piece if we imagine Anactoria to have fallen in love with a soldier. Sappho is clearly away in exile. Anactoria and the other woman are living in the same town, presumably Mitylene. Sappho says in effect: 'You, who are lucky enough to be with her still, have forgotten, it seems, a friend whom I would give anything to see again. For you have fallen in love. And yet it is natural enough; and I cannot blame you. But O that I might have the joy you are throwing away! I know it is no use wishing; but still, past delights are better missed than forgotten.'

Οἱ μὲν ἱππήων στρότον οἱ δὲ πέσδων
οἱ δὲ νάων φαῖσ' ἐπὶ γᾶν μέλαιναν
ἔμμεναι κάλλιστον· ἔγω δὲ κῆν' ὅτ-
τω τις ἔραται.

- 5 πᾶλ' γχν δ' εὔμαρες σύνετον πόησαι
πᾶλ' ντι τ[οῦ]τ'· ἃ γὰρ πόλυ περσκό-
πεισα
καλῶς ἀνθρώπων Ἐλένα τὸν ἄνδρα
κρίνεν ἄρ' ἵστον

¹ κρίνε κάλιστα would also do, in which case we must read κάλιστα in l. 3.

² The καί serves to show that not he but she is the subject of ἐμνάσθη.

ὅς τὸ πᾶν] σέβας Τροίᾱς ὄλεσσ[ε,
 10 κούδ' πα]ῖδος οὐδὲ [φίλ]ων το[κ]ήων
 μᾶλλον] ἐμνάσθη, ἀ[λλὰ] παρᾶγαγ'
 αὐταν
 πῆλε φίλει]σαν

᾽Ωρος· εὐκ]αμπτον γὰρ [ἀεὶ τὸ θῆλυ
 αἰ' κέ] τις κούφως τ[ὸ πάρον ν]οήσῃ·
 15 οὐ]δὲ νῦν, ᾽Ανακτορί[α, τ]ὸν μέμνα
 δῆ] παρέοισας,

τᾶ]ς κε βολλοίμαν ἔρατόν τε βᾶμα
 κ]ᾶμάρνυμα λάμπρον ἴδην προσώπω
 ἦ τὰ Λύδων ἄρματα κᾶν ὄπλοισι
 20 πεσδομ]άχευτας·

εἶ μὲν ἴδ]μεν οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι
 λῶστ' εἶ]ν ἀνθρώποις· πεδέχην δ'
 ἄρασθαι
 [τῶν πέδειχόν ἐστι βρότοισι λῶον]
 [ἦ λελάθεσθαι.]

'The fairest thing in all the world some say is a host of horsemen, and some a host of foot, and some again a navy of ships, but to me 'tis the heart's beloved. And 'tis easy to make this understood by any. When Helen surveyed much mortal beauty she chose for best the destroyer of all the honour of Troy, and thought not so much either of child or parent dear, but was led astray by Love to bestow her heart afar; for woman is ever easy to be bent when she thinks lightly of what is near and dear. Even so you to-day, my Anactoria, remember not, it seems, when she is with you one of whom I would rather the sweet sound of her footfall and the sight of the brightness of her beaming face than all the chariots and armoured footmen of Lydia. I know that in this world man cannot have the best; yet to pray for a share in what was once shared is better than to forget it. . . .'

In l. 12 πῆλε φίλεισαν might be taken 'because she loved afar.'

With regard to Wilamowitz' restoration of the first poem in Column ii. (beginning πλάσιον δῆ), I should prefer to πρῶτοι in l. 3 the Homeric κλειτοί (here perhaps κλήτοι) as in *Od.* 6. 54. κλειτούς βασιλῆας. In l. 7 τέλεσσαι should be changed to περαίνην to avoid hiatus with the fourth line of the stanza.

In Fragment 15 Γόγγυλα is vocative and therefore the *a* is short. The next word, then, must begin with two consonants. One cannot be sure without tracing, but I would suggest provisionally χρύσανθι, vocative of χρύσανθις, which occurs elsewhere as a proper name (Paus. i. 14. 2.). In l. 3 read πόθος τόσουτος.

The *Marriage of Hector and Andromache*, in Papyrus 1232, is of great interest as an epic poem of the class to which some of the non-personal fragments, notably 51 and 54 (Bergk), obviously belong. Catullus' *Peleus and Thetis* is an interesting parallel. In l. 4 read τὰδ' ἔσαν. In l. 6 keep αἰνάω. In ll. 8-10 the editors' difficulty of ἐλέφαις being nominative is got over if we regard πόλλα (as indeed its position shows) as predicate in ll. 8 and 9, and ἀνάριθμα as predicate in l. 10. In l. 9 for ἀθύρματα read ἀθρήματα, which Hesychius explains as δῶρα πεμπτόμενα παρὰ τῶν συγγενῶν ταῖς γαμουμέναις παρθέναις παρὰ Λεσβίοις. Hoffmann, *Gr. Dial* ii, p. 228, compares θεώρητρα. Lines 16-19 I would restore thus:

ἵπποις δ' ἄνδρες ὑπαγον ὑπ' ἄρ[ματα
 χάλκῃα
 πάντες αἰθεοί· μεγάλωσι δ' ἔνν μέγας
 δ[ᾱμος]· κἀνίοχοι . . .,

comparing the Homeric κείτο μέγας μεγάλωσι, *Il.* 16. 776 *et al.* In l. 20 πύλας ἔξαγον is probable. In l. 2 of Column iii. read κασία λίβανός τ' ὀνελίχυντο, which I would connect with λίγνυς. For the *χ* cf. διωχμός Hoffm. p. 519, μείχυνντες, Alc. Pap. 1234 fr. 3. l. 13 and μείχ[1233 fr. 8. l. 11.

(b) ALCAEUS.

In the first fragment of column ii. of Papyrus 1233 we have what may well be a complete poem of Alcaeus. Much turns on the restoration of the first line.¹ My suggestion is ἔμμεν ἄρᾱ, the latter word being 2nd person of ἄρᾶμαι 'to pray' (so Sa. 1231 fr. 1. col. i. l. 37 and probably also fr. 15 l. 9; cf. the adjective ἄρᾱταν in fr. 1 col. ii. l. 3 of the same Papyrus). This when traced from the extant parts of the MS. fits exactly.

¹ *I.e.* of the poem, not of the column.

Parted by exile from his friend Melanippus—Alcaeus was exiled twice—the poet tells him that it is as vain to deplore their separation as to hope to live again when Acheron is passed. Then comes the ‘myth’ of Sisyphus, who thought he had escaped death, but found he had to cross the river for the second time, and crossed it to condign punishment. ‘Now if ever,’ he goes on, ‘is it useless to cry out against one’s lot. Some of these things we must bear in patience. When the North Wind rises’—Pittacus, who banished him, was of low birth and Thracian extraction (Diog. Laert. i. 4) —‘skilful pilots do not put to sea.’ And so the poem ends after all with a hint of the possibility of a brighter future. I would suggest the following restoration:

Τί ὦν ἔ[μμεν ἄρᾱ], Μελάνιππ’, ἄμ’
 ἔμοι; τί [δὲ
 διννάνεντ’ ὅτα κ’ [εἰς] Ἀχέροντά μ’ ἔη[σι
 κᾶρ,
 ζύβαι[ς ἁ]ελίω κόθορον φάος [ἐλπίσω
 ὄψεσθ’; ἀλλ’ ἄγι, μὴ μεγάλων ἐπ[ι-
 βύλλεο.
 5 καὶ γὰρ Σίσυφος Αἰολίδαις βασίλευς
 [ἔφα
 ἄνδρων πλεῖστα νοησάμενος [θάνατον
 φύγην·
 ἀλλὰ καὶ πολυῖδρις ἔων ὑπὰ κᾶρι [δὲ
 διννάνεντ’ Ἀχέροντ’ ἐπέραισε· μ[όρεν
 δέ οἱ
 κάτ]ω μ[όχ]θον ἔχην Κρονίδαις βά[ρυν
 ἔξοχα
 10 μέ]λαινας χθόνος. ἀλλ’ ἄγι μὴ τά[δ’
 οἰδύρρεο·
 ἄσ]σα βάσομεν αἶ ποτα κᾶλλοτα ν[ῦν
 μάται.
 ἀλλ’] ἦν ὅττινα τῶνδε πάθην τα[λασι-
 φρόνως
 πρόσηκ’· ὅττ’ ἄνε]μος βορίαις ἐπι-
 [τέλλεται,
 [οὐ] σόφων ἀνάγην σκάφος εὔρεαν εἰς
 ἄλα.]

This may be translated thus:

‘O why, Melanippus, do you pray you might be with me? or why, when once fate has sent me to eddying Acheron, shall I hope to re-cross it and see again the pure light of the sun? Nay, set not your desire on things too great. King Sisyphus, son of Aeolus, he thought

with a craft unsurpassed to have¹ escaped death, but for all his cunning he crossed the eddying Acheron in fate the second time, and the son of Cronus ordained that he should have below a toil the woofullest in all the world. So I pray you bewail not these things [or lament not thus]. If ever cries were unavailing our cries are unavailing now. Assuredly some of these things were to be suffered with an enduring heart. When the wind rises in the north, no skilful pilot puts out into the wide sea.’

In l. 2 the Papyrus has οταμε[κ’ εσ]-δινναενταχερονταμεη[, a misplacement primarily due to the late position of ὅτα and aided by the occurrence of διννάνεντ’ Ἀχέροντα in l. 8. For the phrase εἰς Ἀχέροντα cf. e.g. Theocr. 12. 19. For the form ἔησι (the letters εη in the Papyrus are certain), cf. Hom. ἦσι, *Adesp.* 47B ἄδησι, and Sa. 12 and 36 θέω. In l. 3 for ἐλπίσω cf. *Inscr.* σκευάσην Hoffm. p. 581. Lines 4-7 are so restored by Wilamowitz. For the form ἄγι cf. ὄψι=ὄψέ *Adesp.* 57. In l. 5 the Papyrus has σεισυφος. In ll. 8-10 Wilamowitz suggests μ[έγας δέ οἱ and βά[ρυν ὥρισε, taking κάτω (as seems unlikely) with χθόνος; cf. Sa. 1231 fr. 1 col. i. l. 14 ἐπὶ γὰν μέλαιναν of ships. The word μόρεν is the Homeric ἔμμορεν; but we should probably read ἐπέραισ’· ἔμμορεν with the single-consonant form, comparing e.g. *δισχελίοις* 1234 fr. 1 l. 8 beside *χελλιοι* *Inscr.* Hoffm. p. 486. In l. 11 the Papyrus had ἄτ]τα (not κατα, which is too short); for the Attic ττ wrongly introduced into MSS cf. *κυππατιδες* Alc. 15. 6 (Bergk). The word βάσομεν represents βοάσομεν, cf. *βαθοεντι* for *βοηθοῦντι* *Inscr.* Hoffm. p. 296. In the same line cf. Hesychius μάται· διατρίβει, χρονίζει, ‘wastes time’; this is the 3rd person of μάταιμι.

In Fr. 2 col. ii. most of Wilamowitz’ reconstruction is satisfactory. But I should prefer to restore the first stanza thus:

ὥς λόγος κάκων ἀ[πύφνιε Φέργων
 Περράμῳ καὶ παῖσ[ι Φρύγεσσι]ν ἄλμα
 ἐκ Φέθεν πίκρον· περὶ δ’ ἔλλατο φλόξ
 Ἴλιον ἴραν.

In l. 1 the Papyrus probably had -εν ἔργων. In l. 3 it has εκσεθεν with κ

changed to ξ; ὥς λόγος is surely incompatible with Helen in the second person. The archetype doubtless had ἐκ ἔθεν. I would translate thus:

‘Through her ’tis said there sprang from evil deeds a branch bitter unto Priam and all the Phrygians, and a flame rolled around sacred Ilium.’

The imperfect ἀπύφνιε is regular where an action is going to be referred to again as finished or interrupted; here it is finished in περιέλλατο. For ἄλμα cf. *E. M.* 69. 27 ἄλμα . . . λέγεται δὲ καὶ ὁ κλάδος παρὰ Αἰολεῦσι (*Hoffm.* p. 229). For ἔλλατο from εἶλω cf. *Homer's* ἔλσα, *Simonides' ἡλσάμην* (*fr.* 17), and *Hoffm.* p. 486. *Wilamowitz* suggests ἀ[νέτηλ’ ἀπ’ ἔργων, παῖσ[ι τέλος φίλοισιν] (‘dear sons’), and π[ύρι δ’ αἰθάλωσας]. But ἀνατέλλειν τέλος is awkward, and the subject of αἰθάλωσας would almost certainly have been expressed; moreover, we should expect ‘his dear sons.’ In l. 10 I should prefer to keep the dative παρθένῳ, comparing e.g. *Il.* 4. 215.

Fragment 32 contains a poem of which we already had the first line and a half in *Plutarch* (*Bergk* 42). The passage runs thus: διὸ μάλιστα τοὺς ἀνηθινοὺς (*MSS.* ἀνθίνους) ἐκ τῶν τραχύλων καθάπτοντες ὑποθυμίδας ἐκάλουν καὶ τοῖς ἀπὸ τούτων (i.e. ἀνήθων) μύροις ἔχριον τὰ στήθη· μαρτυρεῖ δὲ Ἀλκαῖος κελεύων καταχέαι τὸ μύρον αὐτοῦ (αὐτῷ ?) κατὰ τὰς πολλὰ παθοίσας κεφαλᾶς καὶ τῷ πολὺ στήθεος. With *Plutarch's* aid we get a good start. The remaining four lines are easier to restore than one would think at first sight. The reason for this is twofold: first, the sentences happen to divide in the extant part, and secondly the key-words πωνόντων, ἔδοσαν, μετὰ δ’ ἄλλων, ὁ δὲ μῆ, and ἀπόλ[], are fortunately preserved. My restoration is as follows:

Κατ τὰς πόλλα π[αθοίσας κεφαλὰς κἀκχέ
μοι μύρον
καὶ κατ τῷ πολ[ίῳ στήθεος· αἶ γάρ τιςί
κ’ ἄλγος ἦ,

πωνόντων. κἀκα [δὴ] παῖσι βροτοῖς ἐσι
ὄτ’ Ὀλύμπιοι
ἔδοσαν, πεδὰ δ’ ἄλλω[ν τόδε μοι κωὺκὶ
μόνῳ πάθος

ἀνθρώπων. ὁ δὲ μῆ φ[αῖς ἄγαθον πώνεμεν
ἔμμεναι
[κ]ῆν[ω] φαῖσθ’ ‘Ἀπόλ[οι]’ οὐ γὰρ
ἴσαισθ’ ὄγαθον οὐδ’ ὁ μῆ.’

‘Over my long-suffering head, over my hoary breast, pour me the unguent. If any man be in pain, then let him drink. To all men soon or late the Olympians give misfortune, and this woe of mine I share with other men. And as for him that says there is no good in drinking, you may say to him “Be hanged with you! you know not good from bad.”’

For Ὀλύμπιοι in a similar connexion cf. 1234 fr. 2. col. i. l. 11. For ἴσαισθα cf. my note on *Theocr.* 30. 13 *C. R.* 1911 p. 67. For ὄγαθον = ὁ ἄγαθον, cf. *ὦνηρ* *Sa.* 2 and *Alc.* 25.

Papyrus 1233 fragment 4 has been well restored by *Wilamowitz*, but in the first stanza approximate certainty can only be got by letter-tracing, and there is unfortunately no photograph. The same difficulty occurs in l. 10, where however I would suggest provisionally

πύλοθεν λάμπροι πρότονον σάοντες,

literally ‘saving our forestay by your far-shining light.’ *Aeschylus, Ag.* 897, calls the forestay σωτήρα ναός. The saviour in *Aeschylus* is the saved in *Alcaeus*. For the form σάοντες see below. The Papyrus has λάμπροιτο[. . . .]ντες with προ[over ιτο[. Now]ντες has a stop after it, and presumably is the end of the line. If so, there is not room in the gap for the requisite number of syllables. The interlinear gloss, therefore, may reasonably be taken as a correction, and πρότονον not only suits the sense, but is a word easily corruptible anywhere in its last two syllables and here in its first. I believe the scribe wrote λαμπροιτονοσαοντες or λαμπροιτονονσαοντες. Letter-tracing alone can decide which.

In 1234 fr. 3 we have part of a poem dealing with the Ship of State. Fragments 18 and 19 (*Bergk*), as the editors point out, have the same subject and the same metre. The context of those fragments implies that they come from separate poems. And it is plain, I think, that the new fragment can belong

to neither. In both of the old fragments the poet is present in the ship; here—even discounting my reading of l. 10—he is certainly ashore, i.e. in exile.

I suggest the following restoration:

πὰν φόρτιον δ' ἔρριψαν αὐτοῖς
δ' ὅτι μάλιστα σάο[ισι ναῦται·

καὶ κύματι πλάγεις[α βαρυκτύπῳ
ὄμβρῳ μάχεσθαι χε[ίματι τ' οὐκέτι
5 φαῖς] οὐδεν ἰμέρρη[ν, ἔκοισα
δ' ἔρματι τυπτο[μένα κε δύννην.

κῆνα μὲν ἐν τούτῳ 'στίν· ἔγω δέ κε
τούτων λελάθων, ὃ φίλοι αἰνται,
σύν τ' ὕμμι τέρπ[εσθαι θέλοιμι
10 καὶ πεδὰ Βύκχιδος αὐθ[ι δαίτος.

τῷ δ' ἄμμες ἐς τὰν ἀψ ἔρον ἄ[γρεμεν,
αἰ καὶ τις ἀφ[ρων π]άντα τ[ύραξέ οἱ
μείχυντε[ς . . . ;

This may be rendered thus:

' . . . The sailors have cast all their cargo overboard and are saving themselves as best they can. Meanwhile, beaten with the roaring wave, she be-thinks her that she no longer desires to fight with storm and tempest but would willingly strike a reef and go to the bottom. That is her plight; but as for me, dear comrades, I would forget these things and make merry here both with you and with Bacchus. And yet why do we take our love off our country, even though fools have thrown all she hath into confusion, mingling . . . ?'

We have here the prototype, perhaps, of such passages as the famous *suave mari magno* of Lucretius.

In l. 2 for σάοισι cf. Hoffm. p. 264. In l. 3 βαρυκτύπῳ is due to Wilamowitz. In l. 4 the Papyrus has ὄμβρῳ. At the end of the line Wilamowitz reads χεῖματι δ' ἀγρίῳ. But βαρυκτύπῳ goes better with κύματι, and then, ὄμβρῳ having no epithet, χεῖματι is better without one; οὐκ, too, is expected *before* φαῖσι, and ἔτι is probably required by the sense. In l. 6 Mr. R. D. Hicks suggests κε δύναι, which I have altered to κε δύννην (= δύνειν) because of the tense of τυπτομένα. In line 8 for αἰνται cf. Alc. 41 (Hoffm.). If the shortening of a diphthong before a vowel is a licence only to be expected in a poem of epic flavour

like 1232 fr. 1 col. ii. (of which cf. l. 5), we may fall back on φίλ' ὀμιλλία, comparing Hoffm. p. 238 for the feminine vocative in ᾱ. The word ὕμμι shows that the vocative is plural or collective-singular. Lines 11-13 are difficult. The α after τις must scan long; I should therefore suggest ἀφρων πάντα; but one needs to apply the tracing-test. For the first word of the line the Papyrus gives τῷ. I think it must stand for τιῷ=τίνι with the meaning 'wherefore?' 'for what?'; cf. ὅττω genitive, Sa. 1231 fr. 1 col. i. l. 15 and Hoffm. p. 559. The last word of the line must be a verb in the 1st person plural. Only three syllables are available and these must begin with α (I take it that by α the editors mean there is a trace of a letter which might be α; and as the metre tells us that this letter must be a vowel, α seems to be certain). I have thought of ἄγομεν, ἀφθεμεν (= ἀπόθεμεν), ἀβδομεν (= ἀπόδομεν)—for these two cf. ἐβφερέτω Alc. Berl. frag. (N.F. 2a 16)—, and finally ἄγρεμεν. Of the word ἀγρέω there would be parts derived from all three forms ἀγρέω, ἀγρήω, and ἄγρημι, cf. Hoffm. pp. 572 ff. This belongs to the last, to which a corresponding third person plural survives in Sappho's ἐπιρρόμβεισι. (Compounds of ἀνὰ are possible here if we suppose the scribe to have varied between ἀν and ὄν like the writer of 1232, see fr. 1 col. ii. l. 11 and col. iii. l. 2; ἄν in 1231 fr. 1 col. ii. l. 22 is certainly the preposition.) The plural μείχυντες after τις is strange, but not, I think, impossible, see L. and S. τις A. II 2. For the form see on ὀνελίχυντο above, Sa. 1232 fr. 1 col. iii. l. 2. For ἀψ ἄγρεμεν cf. Sa. 3 ἀψ ἀπυκρύπτοισι φάεννον εἶδος and Theocr. 25. 66 ἀψ δ' ὅκνῳ ποτὶ χεῖλος ἐλάμβανε μῦθον ἴοντα. The literal translation of the reading I have adopted is 'But wherefore do we take back our love for her,' i.e. 'in reference to her?' Above, as literary English seems to have no equivalent, I have used an old dialect-phrase.

Some of the remaining fragments of the same Papyri will form the subject of a later article.

J. M. EDMONDS.

24, Halifax Road, Cambridge.

IN PROPERTIUM RETRACTATIONES SELECTAE.

III xi 35-40.

tres } ubi } Pompeio detraxit harena triumphos
res } tibi }
haec }

una Philippeo sanguine { adusta O } nota.
 { inusta s }

Accepting provisionally the transposition of v. 36 with v. 40, according to Lachmann, Baehrens, and Professor Postgate, let us look at this couplet as a separate problem, and first collect a few points.

1. 'una harena' is nonsense. Sands have no unity; even if 'intervēnit unum litus' is sound in Stat. (*Silv.* II ii 15), 'unum' there must = 'unicum.'

2. The antithesis 'tris triumphos una harena' is therefore absurd.

3. 'harena' must be supplied with an attribute.

4. The *tibi* of v. 37:

issent Phlegraeo melius *tibi* funera campo,

makes it more than probable that for Pompeio we should read the vocative; this involves accepting the reading of LF:

. . . tibi, Pompei, detraxit harena triumphos,
and further involves accepting either *haec* (the reading of *F*), or what *haec* may have come from—viz., *quae*—at the beginning of the line.

Let us write it provisionally thus:

quae tibi, Pompei, detraxit harena triumphos. . .

'The sands which robbed you, Pompey, of your triumphs. . .'. What does the poet say of these sands? One must conclude that he curses them; and I conjecture that the particular curse is that those sands, dry and burning, may swim in blood:

sanguine adusta *natet*

(*natet* for *nota*, which is suspiciously like the end of v. 36:

tollet nulla dies hanc tibi, Roma, notam).

If *quae* is right in the hexameter, *illa*, not *una*, must open the pentameter.

Remains the mysterious *philippeo*, for which no better explanation has been invented than to say that Ptolemy I was alleged to be the son, not of Lagos, but of Philip (son of Amyntas). If

Propertius would like to see the Egyptian sands swim in blood, he must evidently mean the blood of Egyptians; therefore I would eject the far-fetched Philippic strain in Cleopatra and read *velim proprio*, i.e. *velippo*, out of which *felippo*, and in due course *filippeo*, might derive by that error of *f* for *v* which has already been mentioned in the note on II xxv 39, above.

The resulting couplet at least makes sense and grammar:

quae tibi, Pompei, detraxit harena triumphos,
illa velim proprio sanguine adusta natet!

The *velim* is like

quae tibi terra, *velim*, *quae* tibi fiat aqua
(II xvi. 46).

There are those who will object that an emendation which leaves only two 'words' intact out of five is a reckless one. Let me point out that the number of 'words' is nothing. A line of MS., once seriously corrupt, is a series of letters, not words. For example: N gives at II xxxii 5 *deportantes sed abitur*. To read, as everybody does, *deportant esseda Tibur* alters three 'words'; but it is neither a hazardous nor a violent correction.

III xi 55. *f* and *v* exchanged again. Read:

non hoc, Roma, fuit tanto tibi cive *ferendum*.

hoc requires *ferendum*. *verenda* = *metuenda* was always suspicious.

III xiii 5-8.

Inda cavis aurum mittit formica metallis,
et venit e Rubro concha Erycina salo,
et Tyros ostrinos praebet Cadmea colores,
cinnamon et multi †pastor† odoris Arabs.

Few but Professor Rothstein have not felt a doubt about this spice-farming shepherd; but all the conjectures (*coston* Guyet and Heinsius, *cultor* or *messor* Fontaine and Lachmann) neglect the structural pattern of the quatrain: *mittit* trans., *venit* intrans., *praebet* trans. Wanting—another intrans.

Symmetry plainly demands a verb, and, what is more, a verb to which the commodity shall be grammatical subject. 'The Indian ant exports gold; the Ery-

cine shell *finds its way* to Rome from the Erythrean Ocean; Cadmean Tyre *furnishes us* with colours of purple. . . . It seems to follow that the cinnamon is here the subject. If so, did Propertius use *cinnamon Arabs* for *cinnamon arabum* or *arabicum*? Anyhow, the verb which the sense requires and the letters of *pastor* indicate in anagram is *prostat*. 'Arabian cinnamon, rich in perfume, is sold in the shops.' But if anyone objects that *Arabs* as a neuter adjective is unexampled, there is the alternative

cinnamus et multi prostat odoris Arabs.

III xiv 33. For *Laconum* read *La-caenium*. It is the feminist freedoms of Sparta that please the poet's gallantry, not the Laconian system as a whole.

III xv 31.

ac veluti magnos cum ponunt aequora motus.

32. Euris ubi (sub MSS.) adverso desinit ire Noto.

33. litore *sic* tacito sonitus rarescit harenae.

34. sic cadit inflexo lapsa puella genu.

In v. 33 *sic* is imported from 34. Read *sub*, and all is well with the construction.

III xviii 1-8.

clausus ab umbroso qua ludit pontus Averno
umida Baiarum stagna tepentis aquae
qua iacet Euboica tubicen Misenus harena,
et sonat Herculeo structa labore via.

Euboica Heinsius: *et Troiae* codd.

Baehrens conjectured *tundit*, and *tundit* is right, I now believe; but further changes are necessary. Read:

claustra sub umbroso qua *tundit* pontus Averno,
umida Baiarum stagna *tepetis* aquae.

tepentis aquae is hardly possible as an Augustan pentameter ending (noun and attribute). *tepetis* I have somewhere read, but cannot recollect the author of the conjecture. When *tepetis* is restored as main verb, with *aquae* for its subject, the first quatrain becomes a complete sentence; and Baiae, under the form 'Baiarum aquae,' is addressed in the vocative throughout the first ten lines:

hic ubi mortalibus {dexter NFL} cum quaereret
urbes {dextra DV}

cymbala Thebano concrepuere deo;
nunc invisae magno cum crimine Baiae,
quis deus in vestra constitit hostis aqua?

A very slight change will put this

quatrain also into a regular and self-contained construction:

hic sibi mortalibus dextris cum quaereret urbes.

'When Dionysus was not yet deified, but went about seeking for cities that favoured him, cymbals clanged in his honour here; but now some other and hostile influence abides in these waters.'

9, 10.

his pressus Stygius voltum demisit in undas
errat et in vestro spiritus ille lacu.

Ever since Heinsius, critics have remarked with astonishment that Marcellus' name nowhere appears in the text of this elegy on his death. The difficulty is not removed by reading with Hartmann (plaudente Dr. Enk, p. 266) in v. 1:

Claudius umbroso qua tundit pontus Auerno.

Surely the place where a mention of the name is most pointedly wanting is just this verse 9.

Since Marcellus was neither drowned nor done to death by taking the waters of Baiae, I fail to see that *his pressus* is intelligible. Has it displaced *Marcellus*?

III xxii 25.

Albanus lacus et {socii NFL} Nemorensis ab
{sotii DV} unda.
{sotia Pucc.}

Professor Housman reads *foliis* . . . *abundans*, palaeographically very nice; but I cannot silence a scruple: would Propertius describe a lake as *foliis abundans*? 'Overflowing with leaves'? Is the metaphor in *abundans* quite so dead? Possibly there is an allusion to the Diana of Nemi, who might be indicated by

sancta Nemorensis alumna.

IV i 36.

hac {ubi O} fidenas {longe O}
{tibi s} {longa s} erat isse uias.

The last eight letters of this line perhaps represent *exuias*. I suspect the allusion is to the events described in Livy IV 18-19 and 23-24. Possibly something like

nec sibi Fidenas gesserat exuias.

47.

arma resurgentis portans victricia Troiae:
felix terra tuos cepit, Iule, deos.

Read *portas* and refer it to *Iule*.

65.

candentis { quisquis *NDV*
quasis *FL* } { cernit *NLDV* } de
 siquis *v*
 vallibus arces
 ingenio muros aestimet ille meo.

Both in 65 and in 125 I accept Hein-
sius' *candentis* for *scandentis*.

The variants are best reconciled not by
reading 'scandentisque Asisi' with Mr.
Richmond, but 'candentisque suis qui.'
de must be an interpolation: it is not
classical Latin to say *cernit de vallibus*
for 'looking up from the valleys he sees.'
Who is it who 'sees from his valleys
the gleaming walls of a town, and ought
to esteem that town as Propertius'
birthplace'? *Suis* indicates that a
proper name lies hidden under *arces*.
Among the neighbouring peoples are
the Arnates (see Pliny, *N. H.* III 113),
who inhabited Arne down in the valley
below Assisi and Perugia. Read then:

candentisque suis qui cernit vallibus Arnas
ingenio muros aestimet ille meo.

71.

quo ruis imprudens? vage { dicere *O* } { fata *O* }
 discere *s* } { facta *s* }
Properti.

Propertius in no sense *dicat fata*, and
dicere facta could only mean 'to state
facts.' That is not the point; what
Horus wants the poet to do is to listen
to his prophecies. Read:

age, disce futura, Properti!

age is due to Marcilius.

81. pretium facere alicui = to raise
someone in value or estimation, to do
him credit. Accordingly, for

nunc pretium fecere deos et fallitur auro
Iuppiter obliquae signa iterata rotae,

read:

nec pretium fecere deo si fallitur auro
Iuppiter, obliquae signa iterata rotae—

i.e., 'Reading on the globe the sun's
repeated passage through the Signs
(that is, Astrology) brings no credit to
the god if the astrologer swears falsely
about Juppiter for gold.'

Rothstein illustrates this meaning of
fallitur Iuppiter from *Ov. Am.* III xi 45:

per omnes
qui dent fallendos se tibi saepe deos.

124.

et lacus aestivis intepet umber aquis.

intepet, which is used by Statius

(*Theb.* II 377), has been needlessly im-
pugned by Professor Housman as un-
classical, but it does seem an impossible
word to apply to a lake. Also, there
happens to be no lake there, nor
record of a lake. Perhaps Propertius
wrote:

lucus et aestivis intepet uber(s) aquis,
the scene being the same as what he
described in II xix 25:

qua formosa suo Clitumnus flumina luco
integit.

IV ii 5.

haec *NFL* { mea *NFL* }
nec *DV* { me *DV* } turba iuvat nec templo
laetor eburno.

Correct to

nec delubra iuvant, etc.

28.

corbis *FL*
corbis in *Nv* } imposito pondere messor eram.
corbis ab *DV*

Read *corbibus* (dat.), 'When my baskets
were loaded up, I was quite the har-
vester.'

34.

fauor *N*
faunor *FL* } plumoso sum deus aucupio.
faunus *DV*

Read:

fabor 'plumoso sum deus aucupio'

(another case of *b* and *v* exchanging:
see n. on III vii 45). *fabor* occurs in
IV iv 2. Cf. also IV vi 60:

sum deus: est nostri sanguinis ista fides.

35.

est etiam aurigae species Vertumnus et eius
traicit alterno qui leve pondus equo.

Read:

est ut in aurigae speciem vertamur etc.

44.

caeruleus cucumis tumidoque cucurbita ventre
me notat et iunco brassica vincta leui.

For *me notat* read *pendent* (*ndict* = *notat*).
Cf. Virg. *Copa* 20.

IV iv 39.

quid mirum in patrios Scyllam saevisse capillos
candidaque in saevos inguina versa canes?

Read:

quid mirum [in] patrios Scyllam secuisse capillos.

But who is the author of the correction,

fewer ships. No ground exists for alleging that the other 150 or 200 trading ships all started from Boulogne or from any particular spot; for all I know, a few may have waited at Wissant. We are, then, entitled to urge that, if Caesar used Boulogne and if he found the room scanty, he would not have lessened it further by admitting eight or ten score trading ships. Those who argue against Boulogne on this head must reckon with 600-650 ships.

3. *The 'nautical opinion.'* Mr. Holmes cited a 'nautical opinion' that even 800 ships might have been got out in reasonable time, and I mentioned it. Mr. Holmes demurs that I omitted an important condition, 'given sufficient depth and extent of water.' I did omit that condition, since it reduces the opinion to nonsense. Given sufficient depth and extent of water, the *Imperator* could steam up to Mr. Holmes' front door in London; but to say so would be to talk nonsense. I took the 'opinion' to be loosely worded, and to mean that the ships could be got out with a depth and extent of water which might reasonably be assumed. If it did not mean that, it meant nothing.

4. *Medieval armies at Wissant.* Everybody agrees that Wissant was much used in the Middle Ages. I still seek for proof that it was used by armies, and I add here (what I wrote in my December rough copy and cut out for brevity!) that, at least in this context, 3,000 men do not make an army. Of substantial forces at Wissant even Mr. Holmes can quote only one case, the Earl of Leicester's attack on England in 1173. This case has been twice adduced by him, in *Ancient Britain* (p. 580) and in his March article. In the former he argued that the story did not prove that a large force sailed from Wissant; now he argues that it does prove that; in neither place has he quoted the story aright. The most detailed and perhaps the best account of the expedition is given by the contemporary Ralph de Diceto. According to him the Earl sailed from Wissant (as Mr. Holmes says) *plurima comitante caterva*, landed at Walentona in Suffolk (Walton, near Felixstowe), sent his ships back in haste—presumably to bring up more troops collected by his continental backers—

gained some local reinforcements, marched inland towards Leicester, and presently met and fought the royal forces. In this battle, says Diceto, he put his trust chiefly in 3,000 *Flandrenses*; they were almost annihilated, the Earl was captured, and the enterprise collapsed. Another contemporary account, rather scantier in detail and more rhetorical in phrase, by the unknown writer who used to be called Benedict, talks of an *infinitus exercitus Flandrensium*, of whom 10,000 fell. There are thus two versions, one that the *Flandrenses* numbered 3,000, the other that they were 'infinite' and more than 10,000 strong. Most people would prefer the first version. Mr. Holmes does not even mention it, nor does he mention two facts (material to the enquiry how many men sailed with the Earl from Wissant), the sending back of the ships, and the local reinforcements. Both of these might have increased the Earl's army a good deal; in view of them, it is doubtful whether he originally sailed from Wissant with a very large force.

Nor again is Mr. Holmes correct in calling Wissant 'a nest of pirates,' on the authority of Matthew Paris. Matthew does not say that. He says that the French coast-folk, including 'naucleri' of Calais and Wissant, interfered with the English fishing; the pirates come in another sentence. How indeed could Wissant have been a nest of pirates when it (so far as I can understand) was never a walled town? Mr. Holmes, in pleading the cause of Wissant, has accidentally slipped into a phrase which fits his case better than it fits his authorities.

5. *Water-supply of Wissant.* The figures given by Mr. Holmes are new and useful. Necessarily vague though they are as to total supply and as to summer supply, they seem to support my doubt whether there was water enough for Caesar's forces at Wissant in midsummer. He had eight legions—say 35,000 men—and 4,000 Gaulish cavalry, and also his sailors. He must have had, too, a miscellaneous host of 'camp-followers,' both for his own men and for the Gaulish chiefs with him. I will not conjecture their number, but it must have been large, though I dare say that the latest estimate which I happen to have heard, another 40,000

souls, may be too large. He had also many horses, both for the 4,000 Gauls and for his officers, and of course other beasts of burden. On any ordinary calculation, the supply mentioned by Mr. Holmes would not have sufficed for the animals alone, even if—as is impossible—not a drop had been wasted. Mr. Holmes observed (*Ancient Britain*, p. 583) that Caesar's forces could not possibly have been fed at Wissant, and M. Jullian has said the same. It seems allowable to add that they could not have been watered either.

I might add other arguments against Wissant. I might, for instance, quote with approval Mr. Holmes' remark (*Ancient Britain*, p. 569) that 'unless it can be proved . . . that there existed at Wissant a harbour large enough to accommodate Caesar's fleet, the claim of Wissant to be identified with Portus Itius cannot be admitted.' But my object here is simply to argue that, for

reasons given, the case against Wissant is more decisive (while that against Boulogne is weaker) than Mr. Holmes at present thinks. I cannot help suspecting that his discovery of a supposed weakness in the case for Boulogne has led him to change his mind about certain matters which concern not Boulogne but Wissant. That is very human; Boulogne and Wissant are, in a sense and to some extent, running a race to decide this question. But it does not seem logical. The shipping of medieval Wissant and the food and water supply of the place are questions quite distinct from the Napoleonic attempt to embark at Boulogne. Each question must be settled on its merits, so far as it can be settled at all. In *Ancient Britain* (p. 579) Mr. Holmes wrote that 'it is possible to prove that the Portus Itius was not at Wissant.' No new probabilities about Boulogne will alter that. F. H.

NOTES

ON THUCYDIDES II 48. 3.

ἐγὼ δὲ οἷόν τε ἐγίγνετο λέξω καὶ ἀφ' ὧν ἂν τις σκοπῶν, εἴ ποτε καὶ αὐθις ἐπιπείσοι, μάλιστα' ἂν ἔχοι τι προειδῶς μὴ ἀγνοεῖν, ταῦτα δηλώσω, αὐτὸς τε νοσήσας καὶ αὐτὸς ἰδὼν ἄλλους πάσχοντας.

THIS passage has gained something from the discussions in the *Classical Quarterly* of Mr. H. Richards (C. Q. VII 245) and Prof. Rhys Roberts (*ib.* VIII 16), though neither scholar would seem to have arrived at the truth. The latter rests his defence of the second αὐτός of the manuscripts on the only possible basis—a Thucydidean habit of being 'frankly egotistic when historical truth demands it,' and he cites examples of αὐτός, which are due to this habit, from I 22 § 2 and § 3. But he fails to exemplify from Thucydides the hyper-egotism of an αὐτός doubled in the same clause, which appears to me as 'pointless' as it does to Mr. Richards; and he appears to have overlooked the fact that, if in αὐτὸς ἰδὼν the reference is to 'seeing for oneself' in contrast to

'hearing from others,' as in I 22 (and otherwise the second αὐτός is wholly superfluous), then its interposition blurs the effect of the first αὐτός, which should be clearly opposed to the ἄλλους that follows. Nor is his appeal to the repetition of the pronoun in the quotation from Aeschylus at the end of the second book of the *Republic* any more convincing. That there is a world of difference between the tone of our passage and that of the passionate declamation of the tragedy, the interpreter of Greek rhetoric must surely allow. But I agree with him in rejecting Cobet's excision of αὐτός and Mr. Richards' substitution of πολλούς: both, it is clear, are crude and improbable expedients. And as to the last Prof. Roberts rightly observes that it receives no countenance from the passage of Herodotus (inf.) which Thucydides had in mind.

Prof. Roberts notes the slip of the pen by which Mr. Richards writes νοσοῦντας for πάσχοντας; and it is noteworthy. For it suggests that Mr.

Richards' sub-consciousness was, not unnaturally, dissatisfied with the use of *πάσχοντας*, for which *νυσοῦντας* or an equivalent is required. *πάσχειν*, in fact, is not a synonym of the English 'suffering'; and in the parallel expression from Herodotus *εἴ τις καὶ αὐτὸς τοιοῦτον ἔπαθε ὁκοῖον ἂν ἔχη ὁ κάμνων ἢ ἄλλον εἶδε παθόντα* (I 197) *παθόντα* has the same object as *ἔπαθε*. This equivalent it is easy to provide. For *αὐτός* write *αὐτό*, with that vague reference of the neuter pronoun to a subject contained in the context 'the thing in question' which everyone knows to be Thucydidean, and which therefore need not be illustrated at length. For *αὐτά* the following references with the commentators' notes upon the passages will suffice: I 1. 2 *αὐτῶν*, 144. 5 *αὐτά*, II 36. 5 *ἐπ' αὐτά*, V 27. 1 *ἐς αὐτά*, VI 10. 2 *αὐτά*, 18. 6 *αὐτά*, VII 55. 2 *πρὸ αὐτῶν*. For the singular may be cited I 22. 1 *ἐν αὐτῷ* (the very chapter referred to above), VII 47. 3 *ἐν αὐτῷ* and two passages where *δρᾶν αὐτό* is used in a corresponding sense to *πάσχειν αὐτό* here. I 69. 2 *ἐς τότε τε αἰεὶ ἀποστεροῦντες οὐ μόνον τοὺς ὑπ' ἐκείνων δεδολωμένους ἐλευθερίας ἀλλὰ καὶ τοὺς ὑμετέρους ἤδη συμμάχους· οὐ γὰρ ὁ δουλωσάμενος ἀλλ' ὁ δυνάμενος μὲν παῦσαι περιορῶν δὲ ἀληθέστερον αὐτὸ δρᾶ (= ἀποστερεῖ τ. ἐλ.).* IV 59. 2 *περὶ μὲν τοῦ πολεμεῖν, ὡς χαλεπὸν, τί ἂν τις πᾶν τὸ ἐνὸν ἐκλέγων ἐν εἰδόσι μακρηγοροίῃ; οὐδεὶς γὰρ οὔτε ἀμαθία ἀναγκάζεται αὐτὸ δρᾶν* (sc. *πολεμεῖν*) κ.π.ε.

J. P. POSTGATE.

Liverpool, January 24, 1914.

[Omitted by mistake from the March number.—ED.]

NOTES ON TWO SUSPECTED PASSAGES IN THE PHAEDO.

I. 72 D *καὶ ταῖς μὲν γ' ἀγαθαῖς ἄμεινον εἶναι, ταῖς δὲ κακαῖς κάκιον.*

THESE words are dismissed with scant courtesy by many editors; and there is a strong *prima facie* case for their ejection. They repeat the words of Socrates, 63c, *πολὺ ἄμεινον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἢ τοῖς κακοῖς*, and they are entirely out

of place as far as the immediate argument is concerned. The 'proof' that is just concluded is concerned only with the *existence* of souls after death, not with their *state*.

Is it not possible, however, that there is a touch of ironic humour in their reintroduction in this context? In 63c Socrates has stated his confident conviction, *εἶναι τι τοῖς τετελευτηκόσι, καὶ πολὺ ἄμεινον τοῖς ἀγαθοῖς ἢ τοῖς κακοῖς*. After setting forth the grounds of this conviction, in 69d he announces triumphantly, *ταῦτ' οὖν ἀπολογοῦμαι, ὡς εἰκότως . . . οὐ χαλεπὸς φέρω . . . ἡγούμενος κακεὶ οὐδὲν ἦττον ἢ ἐνθάδε δεσπόταις ἀγαθοῖς ἐντεύξεσθαι*. Then Cebes introduces his doubt as to the continuance of the soul's existence after death; and Socrates replies with an argument for immortality apparently complete in itself—the argument of 'generation from opposites,' reinforced by that of the 'constant sum of soul.' At this point it seems not unnatural that Socrates should restate *as a whole* the conviction from the assertion of which the present argument started. Cebes has just admitted the force of the argument: he does not yet see its inconclusiveness. Socrates of course *does*; but he has grounds for his confidence other than those already stated. He plays with Cebes' too ready assent. 'Yes,' he says, 'it is all clear. We are right in our hypothesis; the dead do live again; the living come from the dead; the souls of the dead exist; the portion of the good is better than that of the bad.' Taken in this way, the addition of words so obviously irrelevant to the preceding proof adds point to Socrates' humorous readiness to accept an inconclusive argument so long as Cebes does not discover objections.

II. 74 C. *Οὐκοῦν ἢ ὁμοίου ὄντος ἢ ἀνομοίου; πᾶν γε. Διαφέρει δέ γε, ἢ δ' ὅς, οὐδέν· ἕως ἂν ἄλλο ἰδὼν ἀπὸ ταύτης τῆς ὀψευδὸς ἄλλο ἐννοήσῃς, εἴτε ὅμοιον εἴτε ἀνόμοιον, ἀναγκαῖον, ἔφη, αὐτὸ ἀνάμνησιν γεγενέσθαι. Πᾶν μὲν οὖν.*

These words, rejected by some editors, may perhaps be explained by reference to the order in which the examples

of ἀνάμνησις are arranged in 73C-E. Socrates is endeavouring to establish the theory that the thought of the idea suggested by sensible objects is really a reminiscence of former knowledge. But this is not an obvious use of the word 'reminiscence.' Also it is a less obvious use of the word to say, 'That reminds me of Simmias,' when we see a portrait of Simmias, than to say, 'That reminds me of Simmias,' when we see a friend of his, or an object that belongs to him. In fact, it is more natural to use the term ἀνάμνησις in a case of 'association of ideas' than in a case of actual similarity. So in 73C Socrates begins with the more obvious use, in the example of a lyre reminding us of its owner—ἀνάμνησις ἀπ' ἀνομοίου—and leads up by means of it to the less obvious use: 'We may also say we are reminded of Simmias when we see a portrait of him'—ἀνάμνησις ἀφ' ὁμοίου. Likewise, in 74C, in order to accustom his hearers to the less familiar use of the term ἀνάμνησις, to express the suggestion of the idea by sensible objects, he recalls what he has already established, that it is just as allowable to use the term ἀνάμνησις when one thing suggests another *similar* to itself, as in the more ordinary case, when one thing suggests another *associated* with itself in thought, but dissimilar.

MARGARET E. J. TAYLOR.

Royal Holloway College, Englefield Green.

NOTE ON PINDAR.

ὕδατι γὰρ

μένοντ' ἐπ' Ἀσωπίῳ μελιγαρούων τέκτονες
κώμων νεανίαι, σέθεν ὅπα μαιόμενοι.

Pindar, *Nem.* iii. 3.

THE difficulty of this passage is well-known and has recently been clearly stated by a contributor to *Essays and Studies presented to William Ridgeway*, p. 222, who suggests that the words ὕδατι ἐπ' Ἀσωπίῳ may mean 'the sea around Aegina.' There is, however, no ancient authority given for this appellation, and I venture to think that a simpler remedy is available.

It seems impossible to suppose that Pindar, in a context dealing with a

Nemean victory, could speak of 'the water of Asopus,' and not refer to the celebrated Phliasian stream, which is as closely connected with Nemea as is the Alpheus with Olympia or the Avon with Stratford. Cf. *Nem.* ix. 9: ἱππίων ἀέθλων κορυφάν, ἅτε Φοῖβω θῆκεν Ἀδραστος ἐπ' Ἀσωποῦ ῥέεθροις. But the chorus here is in Aegina; how then can it be 'waiting for the voice of the Muse by the water of Asopus'? The answer, I think, is, that Pindar is here employing a form of expression which he not infrequently permits himself to use. When he really means to say, that he is celebrating an exploit, he sometimes expresses this by saying that he is *at* the place where the exploit occurred. In other words, he identifies the subject with the scene. There are two examples of this mannerism in the first Pythian. Cf. *Pyth.* i. 75: ἀρέομαι | παρ μὲν Σαλαμῖνος Ἀθηναίων χάριν | μισθόν: 'the gratitude of Athens one might gain *from* Salamis,' that is, by writing a hymn on the Battle of Salamis. And presently at l. 79: παρὰ δὲ τὰν ἐνυδρον ἀκτὰν Ἰμέρα παίδεσσιν ὕμνον Δεινομένεος τελέσαις κ.τ.λ.: 'by paying to the sons of Deinomenes *at the shore of the Himeria* the hymn, etc., that is, by writing a hymn on the Battle of Himeria. Again, take *Isthm.* i. 4. When Pindar was invited by Thebes to write the first Isthmian in honour of a fellow-countryman, he was already engaged in composing, for the men of Ceos, an ode in praise of Delos. This ode he for the time postpones and apologises to Delos for the delay: μή μοι κραναὰ νεμεσάσαι | Δᾶλος, ἐν αἷ κέχυμαι: 'may I escape the wrath of Delos, *where I have drifted*,' that is, on the subject of which I have been writing. That this is the sense of κέχυμαι appears from *Pyth.* iv. 43, where the same words are used literally of the clod which fell overboard from the Argo and drifted to the shore of Thera: καὶ νυν ἐν τᾷδ' ἄφθιτον νύσφ κέχυται Διβύας | εὐρυχόρου σπέρμα. Finally, there is *Nem.* iv. 85. Pindar had been directed to insert in this hymn a complimentary notice of the victor's kinsman, now dead, who had gained an Isthmian victory. This he does in words which have caused much trouble to com-

mentators, who either alter the text or do violence to the Greek: *κείνος ἀμφ' Ἀχέροντι ναιετάων ἐμᾶν | γλώσσαν εὐρέτω κελαδήτιν, Ὀρσοτριάνα ἔν' ἐν ἀγῶνι βαρυκτύπον | θάλησε Κορινθίοις σελίνοις*. Some change *ἔν'* to *ὅς* or *ἐνεκ'*, others give it a causal sense, which here surely it cannot bear. The word seems used in its ordinary local meaning: 'let him, dwelling by the Acheron, catch the loud notes of my voice at the place where, in the lists of Poseidon, he bloomed with Corinthian crowns,' that is, 'let him now hear me singing on the subject of his Isthmian victory.'

Similarly, I suggest, in the passage before us, when Pindar says that the Chorus in Aegina is 'waiting for the voice of the Muse by the water of the Asopus,' he means nothing more than that it is waiting to sing on the subject of the Nemean victory.

W. T. LENDRUM.

Caius College, Cambridge.

NOTE ON EURIPIDES, *RHESUS*, 287 ff.

φόβον δ' ἀγρώσταις οἱ κατ' Ἰδαῖον λέπας οἰκοῦμεν αὐτόρριζον ἐστίαν χθονὸς παρέσχε δρυμὸν νυκτὸς ἐνθηρον μολῶν.

MOST interpreters, from Brodaeus to Professor Murray, explain *αὐτόρριζον ἐστίαν χθονὸς* as meaning something like 'indigenas Trojani soli lares,' though Paley has a scruple and suggests that the slopes on the base of Ida are so called, because they are *ἐν αὐταῖς ταῖς ρίζαις ἰδρυμέναι*, 'on the very foot of the mountain.' There is perhaps a reminiscence of Homer's *ἀλλ' ἔθ' ὑπωρείας ὠκεον πολυπίδακος ἰδης*, but I think that *αὐτόρριζον χθονὸς* is no boast at all, but a modest description of the peasant's old-fashioned mountain home. Cheiron, not because he was anyone's ancestor, not because he was autochthonous, nor because his home was 'in ipsis penetralibus' of any people, but simply because he lived in a mountain cave, had a hearth rooted in the ground.

Hesych. (Nauck *Adesp.* 201) *αὐτόχθων ἐστία ἡ τοῦ Χείρωνος, παρ' ὅσον ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι διήγεν*. The hearth is not built up artificially, but is part of the rock,

just as is the roof of the cave of the nymphs in Dionys. *Fr.* 1 (Nauck p. 793) *νυμφῶν ὑπὸ σπήλυγμα τόνδ' αὐτόστεγον*. The false etymology of Hesychius *Νυμφαὶ ὄρεστιάδες* αἱ ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι τὴν ἐστίαν ἔχουσαι, ἡγοῦν τὴν οἰκίαν, is founded on this notion of the natural hearth. Whether our shepherd is conceived as actually living in a cave is more doubtful, and it is still more doubtful whether we are justified in putting him underground; but I must be allowed to mention that it was Miss Harrison's interpretation of Sophocles *Ichneutai IX.*, 1-7 (in *Essays and Studies presented to W. Ridgeway*, p. 136), that suggested to me the nature of his family hearth. The trackers have heard the mysterious subterranean music of the harp, and Seilenus, *φέρων κτύπον πέδορον*, rouses Cyllene, *πηδήμασιν*, etc. She appears and asks:

*θῆρες, τί τόνδε χλοερὸν ὑλώδη πάγον
ἐνθηρον ὠρμήθητε. . . ;*

There are difficulties in Miss Harrison's suggestion that the Charonian stairs were used in the performance. Is there any evidence for their existence at Athens? But I think it is clear that Cyllene is, as Miss Harrison says, *supposed* to live underground. The use of underground caves must have been more familiar to the Greeks than we should imagine from the scanty references in Schrader to whom Miss Harrison sends us for information. Whence did Hesiod get his notion of Troglodytes (*Fr.* 60), or Aeschylus his description of primitive man (*P.V.* 456), and Plato his cave (*κατάγαιος οἴκησις σπηλαιώδης*)? It would be pleasant to believe that after the difficult line *νυκτὸς γὰρ οὔτι φαῦλον ἐμβαλεῖν στρατόν* (which ought to mean 'invasion' or 'attack,' not 'landing' or 'arrival') some omission or corruption has occurred, so that *κλύοντα πλήρη πέδια πολέμιας χερὸς* might describe the terrified person who hears at night the tramp of the invader — *πολλῇ γὰρ ἡχῇ θρηίκιος ῥέων στρατὸς ἔστειχε*. But this is mere possibility, and all I wish to suggest is that this rustic has a hearth rock-rooted on the mountains, whether or not he lived in a cave, or even underground, like those other

Phrygians of Vitruvius (ii. 1, 5), and those delightful Sardinians of Diodorus (iv. 30) who ἐξεβαρβαρώθησαν καὶ μεταστάντες ἐς τὴν ὀρείνην ἐν ταῖς δυσχωρίαις κατοίκησαν . . . and πολλὰς ἀγέλας κτηνῶν τρέφοντες οὐκ ἐπεδέοντο σίτου, κατασκευάσαντες δὲ οἰκῆσεις ἑαυτοῖς καταγαίους . . . so lived in safety from their enemies.

J. T. SHEPPARD.

King's College, Cambridge.

ON A NEW FRAGMENT OF CALLIMACHUS' ΑΙΤΙΑ.

VON WILAMOWITZ-MOELLENDORFF has printed some new fragments of the Αἴτια in *Sitzungsberichte der kön. preuss. Akademie der Wissenschaften*, 1914, ix., p. 222 sqq., *Neues von Kallimachus*, ii. Three lines run as follows:

Νύκτα μὲν αὐτόθι μέμνεν, ἀπέστιχε δ'
"Ἄργος ἑὸς,
οὐδὲ ξεινοδόκῳ λήσασθ' ὑποσχεσίης,
Πέμψε δὲ οἱ π[.]ο[.] . . . τῖεν] δὲ ἔως ἔνα
πῶλον.

The scholiast on the third line gives τὸν ὄνον, on which Wilamowitz remarks: 'Vorher muss nach dem Scholion eine Glosse mit dem sinne "Esel" gestanden haben, die ich vergeblich gesucht habe.' Is the missing word ὑποζύγιον? The Papyrus has ΟΙΠ[.]Ο[.]], and τῖεν is Wilamowitz's conjecture, based on *Hecale*, fr. 41. ΟΙ and Τ are often interchanged in Papyri (Thackeray, *Grammar of The Old Testament in Greek*, I., pp. 93, 94); a transcript of one before me now has φοῖλα for φύλα; this gives us υπ as a possible beginning of the word: the number of letters is exact, for while Wilamowitz has printed in his restored text . . . τῖεν (seven letters), he marks eight letters as missing in his transcript.

J. U. POWELL.

NOTE ON AENEID VII. 748-9.

Armati terram exercent semperque recentes
Connectare iuuat praedas et uiuere rapto.

I HAVE always thought of these lines as giving us our best picture of old Italian life in the age of the first settle-

ments and clearings made by invaders who afterwards became Latins, Umbrians, and Samnites. The picture is reproduced in the ninth book, 607 foll.:

At patiens operum paruoque adsueta iuuentus
Aut rastris terram domat aut quatit oppida bello
Omne aevum ferro teritur, versaque iuuenium
Terga fatigamus hasta. . . .

In the former passage Virgil is speaking of the Aequi, the very people who figure so often in Livy's earlier books as descending from their hills to raid the Latin territory in the plain below:

Hi rrida praecipue cui gens adsuetaque multo
Vcnatu nemorum, duris Aequicola glebis.

In the ninth book he is drawing a picture of the Rutuli, who stand in the poem for the wilder tribes then inhabiting Latium itself. Where did the poet get his knowledge of this uncomfortable kind of life, which seems to be peculiar to tribes that still live largely by hunting, but keep sheep and cattle, and have begun to cultivate patches of ground in clearings in the forest, and to hide the produce in pits underground, the prototypes, as I believe, of the Roman *mundus* of later times? ¹ Perhaps he knew of such tribes in the foothills of the Alps, above his own home at Mantua; or he and Livy may both have known of traditions in Latium of the old days when neither your cattle nor your corn was safe from the raids of your neighbours. However that may be, Virgil's terse and intensely graphic picture seems to appeal to the reader instantly as being true to the life. I have recently stumbled on an equally graphic picture of this very condition of life, dating no further back than 1864. It is in one of the best books of travel I ever read, by a great naturalist, whose keen eye was as much alive to the doings of human beings as to those of animals and plants. Dr. Tristram knew his Bible almost by heart, but had forgotten his Virgil, or he would assuredly have quoted the passages I have printed above.

¹ See *Journal of Roman Studies*, vol. ii., p. 25 f.; and Miss Harrison in *Essays presented to William Ridgeway* (on Soph. *Ichneutae*, col. ix. l. 7).

After a first attempt to penetrate into the hill country beyond Jordan, in which he and his friends were themselves raided and robbed, the party hired a strong Arab escort and tried again successfully. The Bedouin tribes in this land of Gilead were, perhaps still are, in exactly the state described by Virgil, hunting, cattle-keeping, and cultivating small patches, which may at any moment be raided by a hostile tribe. On approaching a certain hill village, Tristram's party created a panic among the inhabitants, who took them for enemies on a raiding expedition. 'Cows were driven away in all directions, men snatched up guns and stood on the defensive. When the mistake had been discovered and the travellers passed on, the men, *with their reaping-hooks and ploughshares, but of course with their guns slung on their shoulders*, were hurrying back to their peaceful occupations in the fields. What a country to live in, with a plough in one hand and a fire-lock in the other!' In other parts of his book (*The Land of Israel*, S.P.C.K., 1866) Dr. Tristram has also described the underground pits in which these tribes bury the produce of their fields for safety (e.g. p. 108).

I have long been of opinion that it is exactly this semi-civilised condition of life which was represented in central Italy by the cult of Mars, who has so often puzzled investigators as being at once a *numen* connected with agriculture, and a deity of war, as we know him in historical times in the Roman State-worship. I have explained this in full in my 'Religious Experience of the Roman People,' p. 133 f., from which I may be allowed to quote a few words: 'I do not see in him only a deity of agriculture, or only a god of war; in my view he is a spirit of the wilder regions, where dwell the wolf and woodpecker who are connected with him in legend: a spirit who dwells on the outskirts of civilisation, and can with profit be propitiated both for help against the enemies beyond, and for the protection of the crops and cattle within, the boundaries of human activity.'

W. WARDE FOWLER.

Kingham, Chipping Norton, Oxon.

NO. CCXLI. VOL. XXVIII.

ON THE *MENSAE* OF *AENEID*, III. 257, and VII. 116.

IN *Mnemosyne* 41. 4 (1913), pp. 386 following, there is an interesting discussion by Mr. P. J. Enk, of the latter of these two passages, which has always caused some difficulty, on account both of the question of ancient Italian usage involved, and of the curiously laboured phrasing of ll. 111-115. He argues, with considerable force, that the Servian explanation, connecting the incident with a ritual use of *paniceae mensae*, so called because they were used as 'tables'—i.e., had fruits or other articles of food laid on them, and libation made over them (the ὥσπερ τράπεζα τῶν ἐδεσμάτων of Dion. Hal. I. 55)—should be rejected, and is in fact merely one of the many instances of an αἴτιον wrongly sought by Latin archaeologists. He cites the *Tab. Iguv.* VI. a. 56, for an Umbrian word *mefa*, apparently meaning a cake, and suggests that the corresponding Latin word *mensa* may have originally meant a flat cake, and have become extended to the sense of a flat board.

This seems very unlikely, and the real clue to the Virgilian passage is possibly to be sought elsewhere. If we study the usage of *mensa* it appears most probable that it is etymologically connected with *metior*, *mensum*, and primarily meant a ration, allowance, or portion. So the technical term for a slave's ration was *demensum* (Terence), or *demensus cibus* (Plautus). For the feminine form there is an exact analogy in *impensa*. This meaning clearly survives in *secunda mensa*, which does not mean a second table, but a second 'course' or ration: and perhaps also in the *perpetuae mensae* of *Aen.* VII. 176, which would thus mean not, as generally interpreted, 'long tables' as distinct from *triclinia*, but 'continued portions,' or a banquet of many courses. There would be nothing violent in the extension of the word *mensa*, 'portion,' or 'piece,' to a board whether used as a table for meals, or for other purposes such as those of a shopkeeper's counter, or a chess-board (*mensa lanionia*, *nummularia*, *lusoria*). If, however, there was another old Latin word *mesa* meaning a cake, *libum*, we have here just the sort of play on words

which was the proper foundation for an omen. *Mēsa* would be undistinguishable in sound from *mēnsa* with the nasalised *e*, or at least would be so nearly the same as to make the ambiguity legitimate, and, in proper circumstances, ominous. And this seems to be implied in the *alludens* of l. 117 (*heus, etiam mensas consumimus, inquit Iulus, nec plura, alludens*). The verb *alludere* is extremely rare in pre-Virgilian Latin; except in its primary sense of 'play up to' (*litoribus alludit*, Cic. *N.D.* ii. 100, *quae . . . fluctus salis, alludebant*, Catull. lxiv. 67), it only seems to be recorded twice: Ter. *Eun.* 434, *ad id alludere*, 'to joke about it'; and Cic. *Or.* i. 240, *alludens varie*, 'playing with various arguments.' The sense in the line of Virgil obviously is 'playing with' the word—*i.e.*, with its double meaning, or punning upon it, but not himself recognising the ominous import of his pun, as is done by Aeneas, who immediately stops him in order that the omen may not be spoiled by any further words.

If we read the passage aloud, bearing

in mind that *mēsa* and *mensa* have practically the same sound, the connexion would be perfectly clear; what would obscure it, and what may have caused Virgil some difficulty in handling the incident, is that in the written poem one is obliged to spell the word definitely either in one way or in the other. The author of the *Dirae*, we may conjecture, would have explained the point beforehand by adding a line between 109 and 110:

Et adorea liba per herbam
(Liba vocant Itali antiquo quae nomine mesas)
Subiciunt epulis.

But that is not Virgil's way. He has done what he could to prepare us for a surprise by the laboured and retarded wording of ll. 113-115, and he leaves it at that.

It may be some confirmation of the theory here suggested, that the jingle of *ambesas mensas* in *Aen.* iii. 257 seems to point towards the use by Virgil there of the wording of some old Latin rhyming prophecy or song.

J. W. M.

REVIEWS

THE HISTORY OF THE SOCIAL QUESTION IN THE ANTIQUE WORLD.

Geschichte der sozialen Frage und des Sozialismus in der antiken Welt. Von ROBERT VON PÖHLMANN. 2 vols. Pp. xvi+610: xii+644. Munich: Beck, 1912. M. 26.

I.

PROFESSOR VON PÖHLMANN is to be congratulated on this, the second and enlarged edition, of his *History of Ancient Communism and Socialism*. In changing the title of the work, he has indicated more accurately its contents. He has, indeed, almost changed his book to a social and economic history of antiquity. I have rarely come across a work which has shed so much new light upon the numerous social problems of the classical world, and the author is so careful an historian that

from the materials which he assembles with great impartiality, it is possible for the reader to draw conclusions which are not at one with the conclusions of the author.

I suppose the sociological impulse is caricatured by Terence in his famous line, *homo sum*, etc. At any rate Chremes finds enough to do at the end of the play in dealing with his own affairs. Pöhlmann, however, expands the maxim when he declares (I. pref. vii): 'Unless we are in a position to build up our science of the antique as a science of the antique population in all the expressions of its life, we shall never succeed in making the antique world really alive for us and for others.' Those who are anxious about the political effect of these investigations will be

reassured when they note that Pöhlmann finds in them a warning for doctrinaires. 'Such persons can see what is the meaning for state, freedom, and personality, of that unchained "monster" (Plato's *μέγα θρέμμα*)' which now again 'in the twentieth century with the solid weight of a uniform mass comes creeping on at the doors of the future.' Pöhlmann, however, does not allow his hopes and fears to interrupt the clear current of his exposition. I was about (with the editor's permission) to entitle this review 'The Spiritual Triumph of the Outcast,' when a second reading of the author's prefaces, recalled me to the world which, by definition, has no use for the man who is 'fired out.'

'Plus cela change, plus c'est la même chose.' So, with some reservations, we might state the reign of law in human society. But the main outlines of social life are seen more clearly in one age than in another: in the favoured periods of history rather than perhaps in a self-confident age, such as the present, and the recent past. Socialism appears for the first time as the critic of capital in the sixth century B.C. (I. 160). For the Homeric age had been an age of production for the sake of consumption, and not for the sake of profit. Not yet had there appeared that abyss between the rich and the poor that marked the development of Greek feudalism. When the oligarchies became supreme, the man of lower estate found himself treated after the methods of a merely economic calculation by the noble who should be to him 'a castle and strong tower.' And the movements of the masses buried deep in their misery are at first like those of Enceladus who, when he would complain of his misery, causes earthquakes (I. 194). At Megara the masses, in their hatred against the rich, fell upon the herds of the great land-owners and slaughtered them. The pasture had taken the place of the tilled land. The sheep in Thomas More's phrase had killed the man (I. 195). The countryman thereupon came into the town and took part in the industrial life which was beginning to develop especially in the cities on the shores of the Aegean Sea. But he only found fresh difficulties before him, and this as

early as the time of Solon. Pöhlmann speaks disrespectfully of 'the capitalist jargon of modern times' which talks of 'hands,' and compares this expressive phrase with the Greek equivalent 'servile bodies' *σώματα οἰκετικά*, or with Aristotle's neat definition of the slave as 'an animate machine.' The competition of slave labour was always tending to depreciate the position of the free craftsman. The Athenian democracy, indeed, insured a pitiful survival of the latter class by a system of payments for attendance in the national assembly, and by bribes to attend theatrical performances and other spectacles. It is easy to condemn such a system of finance, but it has recurred in different forms, in the Roman allowances of corn, in the English parish relief of a century ago, in the system of doles which in devious shapes reach the pockets of the less wealthy classes in modern nations.

The cause of these facts is universal: the tendency of capital to grasp at the greatest possible share of the produce (I. 232). War only accentuates the phenomena of peaceful commerce. The impoverishment which war brings applies mainly to those who are already poor (I. 235). But neither Pöhlmann nor Marx does justice to one most important factor which assures the existence of some kind of middle class. Both Marx and Pöhlmann ignore the part which until seventy years ago the originality of the craftsman has always played in production. There are many occupations which cannot as yet, thank heaven, be entirely carried out by machinery or servile persons. The physician, the artist, the thinker, the teacher, must be free if they are to do their best work. And this applies also to many handicraftsmen. In particular the execution of the works of art of classical antiquity gave a chance to the skilful craftsman to rise from the inferno in which otherwise his life was spent. Pöhlmann is scarcely just to the individual patrons of the fine arts. If the divine figures which came from the chisel of Phidias were due to the patronage of the state, the portraiture of Hellenistic, and still more of Roman times, was executed in obedience to the demand of the wealthy

citizen. Surely the portraiture of Athens is as precious to us as its images. Again, the religious drama and the public comedy of the Athenian stage were replaced by the plays of Menander. Here justice has yet to be done. The sculptors of Greek portraits were less successful than Menander in their rendering of human nature. Even the delicate art of Anatole France is a whole world inferior to that of his Greek predecessors. Of course the wealthy patron laughed at art and science in comparison with his moneybags (Plato, *Laws*, 831c). Yet he too was an instrument in the hands of a greater power. The Greek millionaire was something at least of a connoisseur. But when the Roman Philistines arrived with their brute force Greek capital had to bow to it. And so the Roman noble became the middleman between the later art of Greece and modern times. The possession of a fine taste was not graded in the antique world by reference to social station. Hence, when the Greek proletariat found some employment in the great Roman houses, the conquered, by his greater intelligence, took his conqueror captive. Such is the point at which we take up the history of Rome as it appears in these fascinating pages.

II.

Pöhlmann selects many striking passages from Latin authors which harmonise with the formulae which we have found illuminating in the case of Greece. Why should such expressions come so readily to hand? Because, we are told, the historians of Rome transferred to the earlier periods of Roman history the standards of their own day. Thus the Roman nobles are accused 'of lying in wait like footpads to collar the common lands of the state' (Liv. VI. 5). And the disappearance of the small landowner is quickened by the warlike policy of expansion (II. 435). Even Cicero, for whom our author has a rod in pickle, catches a glimpse of the truth. *Patimur multos annos et silemus, cum videamus ad paucos homines omnes omnium nationum pecunias pervenisse*. This text is developed with especial reference to the capital. The ownership by Crassus

of half of Rome, illustrates the perseverance with which land speculators carried on their operations. Blocks of flats rose skywards, in which it took two hundred steps to reach the attics which alternated with the cellars as the homes of the poorest. Such were some of the circumstances of poverty.

Pöhlmann mistakes, in my opinion, the accidental for the essential elements of the social problem under the early empire when he dwells exclusively upon the competition of slavery and the rise in prices (II. 438). No one would gather from his exposition that the world was on the eve of a period of great happiness. The imperial system, with its bureaucracy, made for peace on the one side and justice on the other. These two majestic figures dominated the world; and under their kindly shadow man caught some glimpses of paradise. The state socialism of the Roman Empire wrought up into a new political system the largest number of happy and intelligent human beings who have ever been controlled from a single centre. The concurrent manumission of slaves and the foundation of the first great system of state education deserve fuller recognition than even this large work can find for them.

The historian must measure events by their relation to the future as well as the past. It is only the pessimist who ends his drama always at the fourth act. Surely on Pöhlmann's own principles the bitterness of the defeated oligarchy must not interpret to us the rise of a new world upon the ruins of the old. No longer was the Roman Empire a pendant to the capital. When the legions learned that Emperors might be made elsewhere than at Rome, they bore evidence to the multiplication of those provincial centres, each of which was a little Rome with something of the self-consciousness of the capital. The intensity of the social distress was alleviated by being thus distributed. The brilliant expedient of Augustus, who, by the institution of the Augustales, drew the newly rich into the service of the state, brought out a voluntary redistribution of surplus wealth, and so removed one cause of poverty. It is lamentable that a one-sided presenta-

tion of socialism should close the eyes of so many thinkers to the great political genius of the Imperial bureaucracy.

III.

When the reader, in his progress through these many pages, comes to the seventh chapter, which deals with Christianity, he will find that his not unpleasant labour is richly rewarded. He will be surprised to find that many of the circumstances of early Christianity fall into their place as part of a movement which in one respect was certainly democratic, although the modern professional democrat sometimes fails to see his face in the mirror. Of the three interpretations of Christianity which are in fashion—the socialist, the eschatological, the mythical—Pöhlmann does justice to the first and the second. He does not express an opinion upon the third (II. 587). Some persons might consider it old-fashioned to speak as if Jesus ever lived. I am sorry to say that in order to complete this review it will be necessary to take account of Pöhlmann's daring in supposing such to be the case. At any rate there is nothing antecedently improbable if, in the Roman world as described by Pöhlmann, a popular leader among the poorer classes should reach the cross. Such a fate was so common in those days that it passed into a proverb. Crucifixion was on a par with hanging as it was practised by the English governing class in the good old days. There is nothing therefore specifically prophetic in such sayings as: 'he who does not take up his cross cannot be my disciple.' And yet there are persons who, not knowing the idiom of the masses, treat a phrase like this as miraculous. It is only those *qui se paient des mots*, who can dissolve the great figures of history in a mist of words and,

by refusing to biography every detail which they do not understand, turn tradition into a mythology.

Even Pöhlmann, as we have seen, omits some of the traits which we might expect in a picture of the early Empire. His total effect errs perhaps on the side of an almost unrelieved gloom. But he enables us to understand how the declaration that the old world was at an end, and that a new world was at hand for the disinherited, should have appealed to the masses. The poor had the gospel preached to them. It is instructive to find that the gospel which shows most traces of Roman influence is precisely that gospel which announces the triumphant revolt of the Christian Church against the Roman world. Mark lays stress upon the majestic interference of Jesus with the existing order. But when we come to the teaching of Jesus, as it appears in the oldest source, we find that the maxims of the new order are such as could least have been expected. Unlike the modern socialist, Jesus did not fight capital with its own weapons. The synthesis in which the two warring elements were dissolved was something entirely beyond the scope of either taken alone. The hatred of the rich was forbidden to the poor. On the other hand, the rich were commanded to lend without expecting any return. It is an exaggeration, perhaps, when Christianity is represented as being in its earliest form a socialist manifesto (II. 587). Renan says indeed that, if it had not been for its wealthy and cultured adherents, Christianity would not have survived. It is also difficult to see how, without the poor and ignorant, the Christian Church could have come into being.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College, Nottingham.

THE GREEK COMMONWEALTH.

The Greek Commonwealth: Politics and Economics in Fifth-Century Athens. By ALFRED E. ZIMMERN. I Vol. 9½" × 6". 454 pages. Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1911.

THERE are some works, which, without being the parents of new philosophies or schools of poetry, are nevertheless original in that they exhibit a new pose to old facts, a new way of regarding

what has been the intellectual inheritance of previous generations, a new interpretation of ancient texts. They mark an epoch in the mental development of a nation, if not of humanity. Such a work was Grote's *History of Greece*: and such a work is Mr. Zimmern's *The Greek Commonwealth*. It were supererogation to review, in the ordinary sense of the word, a book of this character. Scarcely is it given to the world, when all who read learn, by conversation and correspondence, that the list of books it is indispensable to read has been altered or increased. It will be more profitable then to discuss one or two subjects on which Mr. Zimmern touches, and to indicate directions in which it is desirable that the evidence should be once again examined.

For the first chapters on Geography we have only to thank the author; if a few details raise doubts,¹ we feel that we learn more than we knew before. When we reach the chapter on the Soil, we have some questions to raise.

(1) Are we to suppose² that Greece was less fertile than England (or Britain) in Pericles' time? Or ought we to regard the soil of England as now better than it was, partly from climatic changes, partly from intelligent agriculture? Not only in this matter but in several other places, the author seems insufficiently to distinguish the differences that are due to race, to physical climate, and to actual date. Take *e.g.*, the following assertion, used to support the view that the soil of Greece is barer naturally than that of England. 'Devastation' says Mr. Zimmern, 'or neglect may take the life out of it, and reduce it once more to useless grit. Hence the effects of a really serious devastation, as in the Decesean years of the Peloponnesian war, are far more lasting than with us. Attica never recovered from it, though she recovered at once from the desultory burnings of the first ten years.' Yet it is said that one campaign of

William the Conqueror left North England a desert for centuries.

(2) Merely to ask the question, can it honestly be said that anything but unfamiliarity makes the Athenian months more 'cumbrous' (p. 46) for dating than our own? ἐνάτη φθίνοντος more 'cumbrous' than twenty-second?

(3) It has been said that beer-drunkness, promptly attacking the locomotive nerve-centres, leaves the Englishman harmless in his cups, whiskey-drunkness, first exciting the passions, makes the Irishman murderous. Is it owing to the character of the ancient Greek wine—of the potency of whiskey—that the drunk Greek could dance?

(4) The author thinks the English standard of cleanliness 'unprecedentedly high.' Has he never learnt the Hindu opinion of us? and the ancient Egyptian it may be surmised would have thought with the Hindu. The Greek's abstinence as a rule from flesh-eating would make his teeth superior to ours, according to our dentists.

(5) Does Mr. Zimmern seriously mean that Thales' 'knowledge of the stars enabled him to predict a good crop'?

(6) The occurrence of olive-signs in Cnossus, Thera, and Crete, hardly disposes of the tradition that the olive came late to the mainland.

When we pass on to the chapters on Politics we are confronted with the good and doubtful qualities of the work. How stimulating, and yet how irrelevant and misleading, is such a sentence as this: 'The Greek peasant understood and enjoyed the plays of Euripides . . . but he had never thought of so simple a contrivance as a windmill.' We might challenge the word 'peasant': we shall certainly refuse the epithet 'simple.' No invention is simple till it is invented. The same confusion between the age of development and the genius of a people recurs elsewhere (*e.g.* in pp. 58. and 62). But we may point out graver misconceptions, as they must appear to those who are not carried with the author.

(1) He writes from the standpoint of one who exalts exclusive masculinity. If a reinterpretation of Greek life is

¹ Is it not more plausible, *e.g.*, to suppose that Atlantis is a recollection of Minoan Crete than the product of 'Carthaginian mystifications' (p. 23)?

² See p. 39 with p. 44 note.

needed to-day, as it must continually be needed, this is an element that needs rehandling, if a prejudice of the proletariat (of which the author seems unconscious) is to be met, and the influence of the classical tradition to be entirely progressive. More than this, the facts of classical literature do not bear out Mr. Zimmern's beliefs. Men,¹ he thinks, meeting and talking 'will naturally talk about things of general interest. Now the chief thing of general interest in a small simple-minded community . . . is . . . the State'. He has only to look at the opening scene of the *Lysis*, or to recall a well-known anecdote about a conversation between Pericles and Sophocles to realize how far the actuality of Athens fell below this virtuous standard. When again he speaks of the Englishman—unlike the Athenian—'brought up to believe, as a matter of course,' that 'every man may do as he likes with his own' and seeks to point this by imagining Pericles trying 'to drive a motor-car through an Attic township,' he forgets the recorded proceedings of Cimon and Alcibiades. And while he eloquently tells how religious the Greek was, and patriotic, 'and never tired of listening to his father and his uncles telling stories of raids and battles,' he omits to bring out how idle therefore the Greek must have been. He was indeed a specimen of 'the idle rich,' and needs explanation if he is to be justified. And this brings us to another serious matter.

(2) The work is written, overtly from a modern standpoint, but it is from the standpoint in reality of 'the classes,' 'the public-schoolman,' and not as a modern work should be, from the standpoint of those who wish to reconcile the interests of all Englishmen in one. Mr. Zimmern deplores indeed the miseries of our industrialism: he sees as an ideal the Periclean craftsmen, but in doing so he betrays the same limitations as I have just suggested. He appears to know something of the

social conditions of Southern England, but the true Labour-centre of modern England—Lancashire, Yorkshire, Durham, and Northumberland—he does not understand. He thinks with sorrow and sympathy of specialism in manufacturing processes; but 'social growth, like biological, is differentiation of the units, so as to perform the necessary tasks with the greatest economy,' and in the North he would find, by means of this, short hours of labour, large wages, leisure, an interest in politics and sport, and a musical skill which is at least the equal in art of the Athenian capacity in statuary. And not to omit definite issues, where is the proof that the true interpretation to put on the drachma a day wage for all labourers, free men or slaves, is that 'the Greek never recognized any distinction between a craft or "trade" and a "profession" rather than that they were all regarded as 'hands'—the free-man forced down to the level of the slave? All the statements of Mr. Zimmern on this question (pp. 254 ff.) seem to allow the view that the Greek system of work was no better than, if as good as, what is to be found in the Lancashire cotton trade. The Greek workmen were often dishonest, they were ill-paid; in the special circumstances of Pericles' time, it is true, there was no unemployment, but we cannot answer for other periods; the potter's home would be more dirty than one of our factory men's, because his work was not in 'a large unsightly modern factory,' and we may ask whether the reason that 'two painted vases exactly identical do not exist' is not that the Athenian craftsmen were incapable of painting two identically.

(3) The author insufficiently realizes what the Greeks before Socrates did know—that Natural Science supplies an intellectual training, (p. 216). We have not room to pursue this and other topics further. We must be content with a few statements by way of contrast to Mr. Zimmern. When we are bidden (p. 213) to admire the Athenians because 'they bravely refused to submit either in mind or in body to the squalid tyranny' Poverty and Impossibility 'have imposed upon the great mass of

¹ The example of the Abors near the Dihong might be a valuable counterpoise to the Ghag parallel of p. 338. And what of the history of the word 'Bulgarian'?

human kind,' we reply (*cf.* p. 407) 'Pericles took the allies' money and paid therewith for the devoted piety and artistic employment of his fellow citizens.' What wonder if he later preached the doctrine of Universal Sea-Power? (p. 427). When we are exhorted to 'get behind the Industrial Revolution' (p. 218), we reflect that there have been countless such revolutions, and that the last must not obscure to us the reality of others. Lastly, it is easy to attribute to social conditions, to climatic or political, what is really the conse-

quence of race. In Northern India there survives to-day a genuine building tradition. The Solomon Islander, the Papuan, and the Basuto are known to exhibit special aptitudes. It is dangerous to speak as if it were possible by copying Athenian institutions to secure Athenian capacities. But we must stop: not the least merit in Mr. Zimmermann is that where he is not convincing, he is provocative of thought and of investigation.

T. NICKLIN.

ΑΤΘΙΣ.

Αθῆς, Storia della Repubblica Ateniense.
GAETANO DE SANCTIS. 8vo. Pp.
xii+508. Torino: Fratelli Bocca,
1912. L. 12.

THIS is the second edition of a work which appeared in 1898. The original views there maintained are upheld in the present issue, which has been enriched by additional notes, referring to all important works and articles that have been published in the interval, and by two long chapters, one on 'Themistocles and Athenian Imperialism,' the other on 'Pericles and the Victory of the Popular Party.' The narrative is thus carried down to the ostracism of Thucydides. The result is an important and authoritative work, usually fresh and stimulating, and hardly ever dull, which will maintain the reputation that Professor de Sanctis has won in another field, and which it is to be hoped will become better known in this country than it was in its earlier form. Professor de Sanctis is of the school of Beloch, and his criticisms of the traditional chronology are generally in agreement with, where they are not the origin of, the views of the German historian: as in the view that Pisistratus suffered exile once only, in the dating of Cylon's conspiracy between the first and second tyranny, and of Periander and Alcæus in the age of Pisistratus. But our author's radical treatment of the tradition is not confined to dates. The general tendency of his work is to

minimise Solon's part in the foundation of democracy, and to assign the chief credit for the greatness of Athens to Pisistratus, who almost takes on the character of a benevolent Italian prince. Some will no doubt feel that too much is denied to Solon, and will be inclined to question whether it were not better to pay more deference to our best authority, and attach less weight to arguments from probability or continuity, which in many cases seem to lack solid foundation. The argument from continuity has little value here: the fact that Solon's work was almost at once superseded invalidates it, and our knowledge of Pisistratus' attitude to the constitution is too slight to fill the gap. Thus, on pp. 241 foll. the introduction of lot by Solon is questioned, and on p. 251 the Solonian *βουλή* is done away and the powers of the Solonian assembly whittled down. On the other hand, the account of Solon's law-courts, which likewise rests on late evidence, errs perhaps on the other side. In his chapter on Pisistratus Professor de Sanctis maintains that to him were due the *ναυκραταί*, which he connects with the general tax and the needs of the navy. He discounts the references to naucreries which Aristotle quotes from certain laws of Solon. He thinks it probable (p. 311) that Pisistratus reorganised the citizen army and himself appointed *στρατηγοί* in addition to the popularly-elected polemarch; the prowess of the victors of Marathon is

thus ultimately due to the Pisistratidae. Beside these rather doubtful achievements of Pisistratus, that which has been generally held to have secured his age the compliment of 'golden'—viz., that he made the economic reforms of Solon workable, falls into the background, and it cannot be said that Professor de Sanctis is altogether successful in showing the connexion between, *e.g.*, the naucraries and the reforms of Cleisthenes. We may note in passing that, unlike Beloch, he accepts Thucydides' statement that Hippias was the eldest son and successor to the tyranny. The account of Cleisthenes contains an interesting estimate of the political value of his work, in the course of which our author signalises the Cleisthenean βουλὴ as perhaps the first attempt in history to

carry out representation, albeit in a limited sense of the word. But as it is his habit elsewhere to put the authority of the *Politics* above that of the 'Αθηναίων Πολιτεία, it is somewhat surprising to find that he denies that Cleisthenes enfranchised a large number of non-citizens. Of the two new chapters all that can be said here is that the reader will find in them an admirable account of the state of parties at Athens during the first half of the fifth century; though it is obvious that Professor de Sanctis, like many modern scholars, is out of sympathy both with the foreign and with the internal policy of Pericles. Appendices II. and III. are devoted to notes on finance and on statistics respectively.

J. R. BROWN.

Pembroke College, Oxford.

DR. WAY'S TRANSLATIONS: THEOCRITUS AND QUINTUS SMYRNAEUS.

Quintus Smyrnaeus: The Fall of Troy. With an English translation by ARTHUR S. WAY, D.Lit. 1 vol. 12mo. Pp. xi + 626. London: Heinemann (Loeb Classical Library). 5s.

Theocritus, Bion and Moschus. Translated into English Verse by ARTHUR S. WAY, D.Lit. Pp. 158. Cambridge: University Press, 1913.

THERE is no more industrious translator of the Classics than Dr. Way, and it is no small testimony to his industry that two such translations should appear both dated 1913. Those who know his work as a translator of Homer and Euripides, Horace and Apollonius Rhodius will expect the scholarly knowledge of the original and the resourceful command of English that they will find in these renderings. The two books differ considerably in their nature and in the general impression that they create. The translations of Theocritus and the other Bucolic poets are in rhyming dactylic lines for the most part; the rhymes are ingeniously employed not only at the ends of the lines, but the caesuras are sometimes

made to rhyme with one another, and at times there is a leonine rhyme of the caesura with the end of the same line; the general effect is a pleasing variety. The translator's difficulty has been in the intractable nature of the English language, which does not supply him with a sufficient number of short syllables for his purpose: several of the lines have to be reread before their rhythm can be detected, and quite long and heavy syllables have to pretend that they are short. Despite the difficulty of rhyme and rhythm Dr. Way succeeds in being singularly faithful for a verse translator. Possibly the most excellent of all his renderings is that of Moschus' 'First Idyll' (*Eros the Runaway*) where the charm of the English is combined with extraordinary fidelity to the original.

We should be very grateful to Dr. Way for making the Epic of Quintus Smyrnaeus available to the ordinary reader, though possibly the reader at the end of fourteen books feels not unmixed gratitude; for the poet has a tendency to avoid the most dramatic versions of such legends as those of Ajax and Philoctetes, and his fondness

for talking about lions in similes suggests the painter of whom Sir William Harcourt once spoke who always recommended the decoration of unadorned panels with the figure of a Red Lion. But there are passages such as the last half of Book X. where he rises very much above his ordinary level. Dr. Way has translated him into blank verse, and considering that he is translating an author who wrote in what had become an artificial literary dialect of more than a thousand years' antiquity he is probably justified in making greater use than in the Theocritus version of the language of poetical 'translationese.' Yet there is something unconvincing in such combinations of 'Wardour Street' English as:

When they leap to meet the kine
Down faring from hill-pastures in the spring
Unto the steading.

or

Her soul was wildered all, as though indeed
There stood the aweless Aeacid living yet.

or again

Then swiftly for their war-fain King they dight
The couch.

Also, though Homer and Quintus both loved compound words, there seems a notable excess of them in the English:

there are eight on p. 13, some of which represent simple words in the original. I have noted sixteen compounds with *heart-* or *-hearted* of the type of 'heart-anguished,' and fourteen with *battle-* of the type of 'battle-blender,' and in one place we have the line 'that battle-eager murderous-hearted man.' One begins to be tired of the constant use of such an expression as 'heaven-abiders' for *Οὐρανίωτες*. Dr. Way obviously loves the sea; wherever he has a passage about the sea to translate he is strong and forceful, and he has a wealth of vigorous language for translating passages about storms and waves; p. 151 contains an admirable example. A few misprints and minor errors may be noted: Hercules and Herakles are used close together; the proper names (e.g. on p. 355) sometimes fail to scan in the English lines without violence to the metre; on p. 197 'unwitting' seems to have replaced 'unwilling' as the translation of *οὐκ ἐθέλων*; on p. 217 'close-lapping' seems a strange translation of *πελώριαι*; on p. 233 *ὥς* is hardly 'O that'; on p. 307 Eurypyus is a misprint for Eurypylus, on p. 353 appears 'th'broad,' on p. 357 'challenge,' and on p. 555 'Vengeance-friends' as the rendering of *Ἐρινύες* is presumably a misprint.

A. S. OWEN.

SOME SCHOOL BOOKS.

- (1) Demosthenes, *On the Crown*. Ed. by MILTON W. HUMPHREYS. 303 pp. American Book Co. 5s. 6d. net.
(2) Xenophon, *Anabasis*. Erklärt von C. REHDANZ und O. CARNUTH. Books I.-III, Seventh edition. Revised by E. Richter. 224 pp., Weidmann. 2 M. 40.
(3) Thucydides II., Ed. by T. R. MILLS. xxix + Oxford Text + 86 pp. 3s. 6d.; Notes only, 2s. 6d.

(1) PROFESSOR HUMPHREYS' *De Corona* is an exceptionally good piece of work. He has taught the speech annually for more than a third of a century, and knows where students find difficulties. He shows great skill and knowledge in

making clear the orator's meaning. Even experienced teachers will get hints from him here and there. The print and binding are admirable. It is worth mentioning that H. interprets *σκηπτός* in § 194 as 'tornado,' referring to Aristot. *De Mundo* 4.19, and quoting the Schol. on Soph. *Ant.* 418 *σκηπτός δὲ λέγεται πᾶν πνεῦμα θυελλώδες, ὅταν συννερείῃ τῇ γῇ καὶ πάλιν ἄνω αἶρη*. The only meaning given in L. and S. is 'thunderbolt,' but, as H. remarks, *συμβάς* would not be appropriate if that were the meaning here.

(2) The *Xenophon* keeps up the high standard of Weidmann's series. The notes are suitable for an intelligent student who has read but little Greek.

Syntax is very fully treated; the Greek usage is clearly stated and illustrated by numerous examples.

(3) Mr. Stuart Jones contributes a general introduction (25 pp.) on Thucydides and his writings, his style, and the MSS. It is a good summary of what is known, but we should like more than four pages about the language, with plenty of illustrations from Book II. There is nothing remarkable about Mr. Mills's notes. He is inclined to be too brief; he sometimes gives no help when, in our opinion, it should be given, and sometimes the note is so much compressed that it is not easy to understand. We much prefer Mr. Marchant as an editor of Thuc.; he gives more help and more help of the right sort as to both matter and language; above all, he has a specialist's knowledge of his subject, and succeeds in communicating his interest to his readers.

Σ.

A Greek Vocabulary for the Use of Schools.

By T. NICKLIN. xii + 103 pp. 7" + 4 $\frac{3}{4}$. Cambridge University Press. 2s. 6d. net.

This is an interesting little book; the writer has evidently expended much time on it, and it is admirably printed. But the plan followed seems to us unsatisfactory, and it is worth while to say a few words on the subject, because many school books suffer from a similar defect. The main vocabulary consists of 1,300 words, which occur 'more than twenty times in the whole of Euripides and Thucydides combined.' Mr. Nicklin does not seem to realise that both these writers use a peculiar language, which make them unsuitable for his purpose. In tragedy 'les mots employés ne sont en notable partie pas ceux de tous les jours, et pour donner au vocabulaire un aspect étrange et noble on recourt à plusieurs procédés.' (A. Meillet, *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*, p. 228). Compare Ar. *Poet* 1,458 b 31 Ἀριφράδης τοὺς τραγῳδοὺς ἐκωμῶδει, ὅτι ἂ οὐδεὶς ἂν εἴποι . . . τούτοις χρῶνται. Thucy-

dides, too, is 'archaistic and poetic in vocabulary. . . . He writes an artificial semi-Ionic dialect, ξύν for μετά, ἦν for ἔαν, πρᾶσσω for πράττω' (Gilbert Murray, *Ancient Greek Literature*). The result is that Mr. Nicklin's main vocabulary has 'un aspect étrange et noble'; it contains, for instance, καλλίνικος, but not οὖς. We suggest that it would be possible to make a more useful list by selecting the commonest words in, say, Aristophanes, Lysias, Plato, and Demosthenes. Such a list would give a truer idea of Attic Greek as it was actually used by a very large number of writers; it would give less prominence to the peculiarities of any one writer or class of writers. We have noted a few mistakes, the most important of which is the substitution of ἐρχεσθαι for ἰέναι. It is quite time that this mistake was banished from school books; we may refer to Rutherford's *New Phrynichus* and to Mr. Richards's remarks in *Class. Quarterly*, vii. (1913), p. 149.

Σ.

A Brief History of Greece and Rome.

By E. C. E. OWEN, of Harrow. 313 pp. Blackie. 3s. 6d.

This is a very successful attempt to tell the story briefly without omitting 'everything that makes history interesting to the young.' It has met with warm approval at the hands of certain competent critics (age 13-14) to whom we submitted it.

A Source Book of Ancient History, by G. W. BOTSFORD and L. S. BOTSFORD (594 pp., The Macmillan Co., 5s. 6d. net) is a carefully edited selection of material (translated) for use with any text-book, but especially with G. W. Botsford's *History of the Ancient World*. Everyone will miss some passages which he would wish to see included—we are specially surprised to find nothing from Cicero's correspondence—but on the whole we think the selection is excellent. It deserves a place in a fourth or fifth form library.

Σ.

LUCRETIANA.

Cicero's Judgment on Lucretius, by H.W. LITCHFIELD. *Harvard Studies in Classical Philology*, vol. xxiv., 1913; pp. 145-159. *Lucretiana*, by J. S. REID, *ibid.*, vol. xxii., 1911; pp. 1-54.

THE highly imaginative character of the introduction to Mr. Litchfield's essay, in which 'the Consular' is pictured in his study 'rummaging through his crowded *pluteus*' and having come upon a portion of the MS. of the *De Rerum Natura*, meditating on the 'sad, utter change' which came over the young poet and led to his untimely death, and then turning to write a hurried answer to his brother's request for gossip from Rome, and concluding his letter with the enigmatical sentence which has puzzled the world 'these five hundred years,' ill prepares us for the extremely elaborate and subtle analysis which follows of the various attempts which have been made to solve the riddle. Though this preface has an obvious place in Mr. Litchfield's 'plot,' and though it is worth while no doubt to make some attempt to recover the mood in which the famous sentence was penned, this 'fine writing' seems a little out of place in a critical study, especially when it is the author's aim to put forward an interpretation which shall rest on no 'uncertainty as to the antecedent conditions' of Cicero's criticism (pp. 150, 151).

But the study itself is of no small value, if only because it succeeds in classifying the rather chaotic mass of conjectures which have been offered and in defining the presumptions on which they rest. Mr. Litchfield sweeps away with a high hand the 'emendations' by means of which many scholars have attempted to put into Cicero's mouth what they think ought to have been his judgment on Lucretius, and confines himself to interpretations of the text as it stands: *Lucreti poemata ut scribis ita sunt multis luminibus ingeni multae tamen artis: sed cum veneris* —. Here he will have the sympathy of most modern students: the time has gone by for the arbitrary insertion of *non* at any

point we please in the sentence, or the 'correction' of the last three idiomatic words which so clearly bear the stamp of a Ciceronian aposiopesis. He then classifies interpretations according to the sense which they put upon *tamen*. I. The first class, represented by Schanz and Hendrickson, suppose that Quintus had drawn attention to the *lumina ingeni* in the poem, and that Marcus corrects and amplifies his criticism by reference to its less obvious artistic finish. Mr. Litchfield rightly observes that this presupposes a condition with regard to Quintus' opinion which we have no right to assume. He might have added that Marcus' reply would have passed the limits of legitimate brachylogy and must have been expressed in terms like those of Munro's 'emendation,' which was designed to get this meaning from the text, *multae tamen artis esse cum inveneris, virum te putabo*. II. A similar objection must be taken to Polle's version, which lays stress on the opposition between *lumina* and *multae artis*: 'there are many intermittent flashes of genius, but the art is sustained'—the expression would be both clumsy and obscure. III. We are thus narrowed down to the third class of interpretations which take the criticism together as a whole, a single judgment of Quintus acquiesced in by Marcus. Of this class Mr. Litchfield detects five species, the fifth having itself four subvarieties: the classification here is very subtle, but there is an appreciable difference between the various interpretations and it is well to have it defined. The first four species may be passed over, as they all involve an obvious straining of the Latin and are not likely to be permanently sustained. Interest concentrates on 5 *a*, *b*, *c*, and *d*, for they contain what may fairly be claimed as the plain-man's view, and 5 *d* is Mr. Litchfield's own addition to the long roll. All four subvarieties agree in their interpretation of *tamen*: 'the poem is characterised by many flashes of genius, yet this is not all, it has much *ars*.' They differ in the motive for the

criticism, in the answer which they would make to the question: Why did Cicero find it surprising that *ingenium* should be accompanied by *ars*? III. 5 *a* would answer that the opposition was a commonplace of literary criticism at the time. Mr. Litchfield seems to doubt this and argues that the contrast of *φύσις* and *τέχνη* was an Alexandrine idea, which appears in Latin literature only in the Ovidian *quamvis ingenio non valet, arte valet*, which, he comments oddly, 'rather implies that Ovid would have expected to find the two qualities united'! I will leave this for a moment. 5 *b* is a pedantic variation on this theme. Cicero was an admirer of pre-Alexandrine Roman poetry and welcomed Lucretius as an 'Ennian' and not an adherent of the *cantores Euphorionis*. He therefore expected to find in him *ingenium*, but was surprised that there was something also of Alexandrine *ars*. 5 *c* and *d* have the advantage in Mr. Litchfield's eyes that they rest on conditions about which there is no uncertainty. *c*, which is the view of Reitzenstein, is based on a consideration of the poem itself: the brilliant passages of poetical description, etc., are opposed to the scientific system (*ars*) of the main body of the poem. This view seems to me to need modification. I do not believe that Cicero would use *ars* to mean 'scientific exposition' (*τεχνολογία*), still less can I imagine that he would be surprised at the occurrence of scientific treatment in a poem entitled *De Rerum Natura*. But if we may take *ars* to mean the technical skill which enabled Lucretius to expound a scientific subject in a poem and in poetry, we shall be nearer the truth. Lastly, in 5 *d* Mr. Litchfield suggests himself that the true solution is to be found in the facts of Lucretius' life as recorded in the famous statement of Jerome's chronicle. The poem was written in the lucid intervals of a recurrent mania: Cicero expected from it brilliant flashes of genius, but is surprised at the sustained artistic technique which would argue consistent sanity.

Both the analysis of previous theories and Mr. Litchfield's own suggestions are of great interest, but surely dis-

crimination has been pushed too far. Is it necessary to assume that a criticism, which is after all not peculiarly subtle or profound, should have been so precisely motivated by one consideration and one only? Does the psychology of even professed critics of literature demand it? and if so, can it be exacted in the more or less casual dictum of a familiar correspondence? Is it not more probable that the original motive of Cicero's judgment may have been a compound of several of these suggestions, and that the very variety of interpretations among modern critics is in itself an indication of the right answer to the riddle? I think it very likely that it may have been the story of Lucretius' life which first caused Cicero to expect in his poem the inspiration of insanity and to be surprised at his technical literary skill and polish: when this contrast defined itself in his mind in reference to individual parts of the poem, he would naturally discriminate, as all modern critics of Lucretius' style have discriminated, between the brilliant passages of free poetry, and the more arid, but none the less skilful, parts of scientific exposition. But what I feel most sure of is that Cicero could not have made this criticism without a perfectly clear consciousness of the universal commonplace of literary criticism, the contrast between *φύσις* and *τέχνη*, between 'inspiration' and 'skill.' I cannot, I confess, understand the suggestion, for which Mr. Litchfield thanks Professor Smyth, that this contrast was a peculiarity of the Alexandrian Greeks. It was at any rate present to Aristotle when he said *εὐφυοὺς ἡ ποιητικὴ ἐστὶν ἢ μανικοῦ* (*Poet.* 1455a 32), and before that to Plato, *Phaedr.* 245a, etc. (see Bywater's note on *Ar. Poet.* l.c.). Among Latin writers it is implied in the *Ars Poetica* of Horace, it is explicit in the Ovidian criticism which Mr. Litchfield quotes, and still more in his even more familiar description of Ennius, which Mr. Litchfield curiously ignores, — *Ennius ingenio maximus, arte rudis* (*Tr.* 2. 424). And if it had taken a concrete form in Cicero's mind, it certainly would have been that of a contrast of the 'Ennians,' representing genius, and

his Alexandrizing contemporaries, representing uninspired literary skill. I cannot help believing that all these four thoughts—and possibly others—were in Cicero's mind when he wrote his much-vexed judgment. In a word, if I am to express what I believe is the view of the 'plain man' in terms of Mr. Litchfield's analysis, I plump for III., I have little hesitation in choosing III. 5; if I must perforce define further, I must select III. 5 *a*, but I shrewdly suspect Cicero would have described his view as III. 5 *a, b, c, d*, or if we attempt so far to analyse his mind as to range his thoughts in the order of their occurrence, III. *d, c* (modified), *a, b*.

The mention of a recent article in *Harvard Studies* may perhaps serve as sufficient excuse for going back upon another very important contribution to the study of Lucretius, which appeared in *Harvard Studies* in 1911, but has not hitherto been noticed in the *Classical Review*. Professor Reid's notes on the first two books are full of valuable suggestions: his wide knowledge of Latin has enabled him to produce many useful illustrations of Lucretius from other authors, and he approaches many familiar textual problems with an impartiality and freshness which a Lucretian specialist cannot easily command. Thus, for instance, his support of the conjecture *inice mentem* in II. 1080 by two parallels from Cicero is of more value than its supposed connexion with the technical Epicurean notion of ἐπιβολὴ τῆς διανοίας on which Giussani relies, for the technical sense is in the context almost inconceivable: or again, his examination of passages in Cicero and others where *sensus* has or approaches the meaning of 'thought' puts the use of *sensus* in II. 887, which has been called in question, practically beyond a doubt. Not less valuable is the negative information on II. 515 that the gen. plur. *hiemum* is found in no extant passage in literature. I had adopted it with misgiving from Munro in the Oxford Text, but shall certainly retract it. There are several passages where Professor Reid's fresh insight seems to settle points on which the editors, blinded by the fog of traditional alternatives, have remained uncertain.

To read *ambiens* in v. 396 (as is suggested in a note on I. 70) seems a very simple solution of an old difficulty: that *multa* goes with *moreis* in I. 398, and not with *causando*, that *Troianis* is a dative and *clam* an adverb in I. 476, that *solem* is right in I. 744, and that there need be no explicit reference there to the 'four elements,' that *uenenum* in I. 759 is a safer expansion than *ueneno* of the mutilated *uene*; these are conclusions likely to be accepted, but which it needed an impartial eye to see. On the other hand Professor Reid's rather detached attitude seems to me sometimes to make his criticism less valuable. I have not space to join issue with him in detail, but would venture to suggest one or two lines on which he seems aloof from the general trend of Lucretian criticism. In the first place he is a little unduly suspicious of the 'subtleties' of Giussani. The Italian scholar's suggestion, *latices* for *lapides* in II. 889, is after all only based on the very obvious ground that in 897 below there is no mention of 'stones,' whereas worms are said to be produced by the action of rain ('water') on logs and sods: the substitution of *latices* would make the parallel exact. Nor can Giussani's theory of atomic motion be quite so lightly dismissed as in the note on II. 125-141. Though most critics would agree that Giussani went too far in reading modern notions into the Epicurean system, yet he surely established that the key to the understanding of Lucretius must be found in the detailed interpretation of Epicurus, and that such interpretation reveals him as a much more subtle and logical thinker than he was taken to be, e.g., by Munro. Secondly, though recent German editors and Giussani himself may have exaggerated their trust in O and Q, Professor Reid, who at times is staunch in the defence of the Leyden MSS., is surely too ready on other occasions to desert them. It is arbitrary, to say the least of it, to decide that in I. 230 the contrast between the *ingenui fontes* and the *externa flumina* is 'insipid' and having on that ground changed *externa* to *aeterna* to demand the further change of *longe* to *large*. Nor have we surely the right to regard *ex aliis sentire sueti* II. 903, as

a gloss—there is very little real evidence of glosses in the Lucretian text—or to alter *Curetas* in II. 629 to *Corybantas*. Lucretius is supporting his own contention of the relation of Corybantes to Curetes by observing that they were actually known as ‘the Phrygian Curetes.’ Nor does the parallel of III. 192—though of course the two passages must be considered closely together—justify the alteration of *papaveris haustus* in II. 453 to *papaveris actus*; I doubt if *actus* could be used of the movement of a solid, and parallels like *haustus arenae* (Ov. *M.* XIII. 526) and *pulveris haustus* (Stat. *Th.* X. 427) show that *papaveris haustus* can well be used in the general sense of a ‘handful of poppy-seed’ without any added notion of swallowing; Lucretius is making his usual appeal to *αἰσθησις*; the draft of water moves as easily as the handful of poppy-seed, for it too is composed of small round bodies. Lastly, Professor Reid seems too unwilling to use Lucretius as a commentator on himself. To decide *a priori* that Lucretius does not use violent anacolutha and then to emend

away II. 342-348, and 1030 (he will have to deal also with I. 455-458 and IV. 123-6) is, to say the least, a high-handed proceeding. Nor can I understand why ‘a glance will show the uselessness of the reference to IV. 123 ff.’ in support of II. 342 ff.: the expression of the two passages is identical, and that in Lucretius means a good deal. As to *praeterea* in II. 342, which seems ‘senseless’ to Prof. Reid as it has to others, it surely introduces the second *a posteriori* argument after the *a priori* argument of the previous lines. This is one of its regular uses in Lucretius (see the very interesting analysis of the Lucretian introductory particles in Mussehl: *De Lucretiani Libri Primi Conditione ac Retractatione*, p. 24.) But I do not wish to become controversial, as nearly all Professor Reid’s criticisms would need lengthy discussion to do them justice. I hope rather to here show how stimulating and suggestive his collection of notes will prove to all students of Lucretius.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

TWO HISTORIES OF ROMAN LITERATURE.

1. W. S. Teuffel’s *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. 6te Auflage, neu bearbeitet von W. KROLL u. F. SKUTSCH. Bd. II., 1910; Bd. III., 1913. Berlin: Teubner.
2. *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*. Von MARTIN SCHANZ. 3te Auflage. Teil II., 2te Hälfte. Munich: Beck, 1913.

OF these two works the first (which in its fifth edition has been excellently translated into English) is well known in this country. Messrs. Kroll and Skutsch have now—1913—completed a sixth German edition (Skutsch, a brilliant scholar, who had many admirers in England, unhappily died just before his task was finished). That the work of revision (and it must have been a singularly depressing task) has been done well may almost be taken for granted. The principal innovation is the definite abandonment of all attempt

at completeness in the ‘Literaturangaben.’ Dr. Kroll remarks truly that a history of literature is a distinct thing from a bibliography. On the other hand ‘Teuffel’ never was a history of literature, and never could be. Even Kroll and Skutsch have not worked that miracle. But it was a work which, contemptible as literary criticism, was highly valued for two things, its full bibliography and its lavish citation of the ancient *Testimonia*. The first of these two advantages it now to a large extent leaves behind. In doing so it gains, of course, a great deal in compactness and clearness of arrangement. Yet I feel that the bibliography might well have been made more ample, at any rate, for that period not covered by Klussmann. Comparing it with what is offered in Schanz, I have the impression that Schanz is very much better acquainted with the foreign (*i.e.*, non-German) literature of his subject

than are Kroll and Skutsch. In particular this last edition of Schanz recognises generously the work of English and American scholars. I would notice further that the new Teuffel, judged merely as a source of information, suffers in yet another particular from comparison with Schanz. It contains nothing corresponding to the sections in Schanz entitled *Fortleben*, in which is briefly sketched the fortune of each Latin writer—the ups and downs of his repute—through antiquity and the middle ages.

It is greatly to be hoped that Dr. Schanz's History will before long find an English translator. Few histories of literature so well deserve the honour, or would so well repay the labour, of translation. Dr. Schanz's literary judgments show always a fine discrimination, and his writing is always interesting in quality. But above all he possesses a notable gift of philosophic generalisation. No other historian of Latin literature has the same power of seizing the principles which connect apparently sporadic phenomena. No other historian can present a complex movement with the same clearness and vividness. Rich in ideas, he never irritates us by paradox; but he leaves the impression always of a man whose mind has taken the whole measure of his subject.

An excellent example of his style and method—to take only one example from the volume before us—is furnished by the sections on Juvenal. Such evi-

dences as we have for the life of Juvenal and for the dates of the different Satires are marshalled in full, and submitted to an impartial examination—in which the writer's judgment seems never at fault. There follows a brief analysis of each of the sixteen Satires. Then the biographical data are brought to bear upon the interpretation of the poems—Juvenal in the 'rara temporum felicitas' of Hadrian and Trajan sits down to satirise the age of Domitian: for this harmless undertaking he arms himself with a purely artificial indignation; he pieces together his satires out of the themes of the rhetorical schools—which have yet, oddly enough, not taught him what is meant by unity in composition; in his criticism of life he is a disillusioned and humourless academic, who, having adopted the paradox that there is nothing in the world but dirt, takes a good deal of pleasure in rolling in it. Dr. Schanz's picture is executed rather more gently than my *résumé* suggests; and will not hurt the feelings even of those who think Juvenal a greater poet than he is or a better man than he perhaps was. In any case, the example I have taken will suffice to indicate that, with immense learning, Dr. Schanz is never dull. He never says only what he is expected to say.

Everyone will wish him a happy completion of his immense task.

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College, Oxford.

SHORT NOTICES

Centaurs in Ancient Art: the Archaic period. By PAUL V. C. BAUR. 4to. Pp. viii + 140; 38 text illustration; 15 plates. Berlin: K. Curtius, 1912.

DR. BAUR's work consists of a *catalogue raisonné* of all the representations of Centaurs in ancient art down to B.C. 480, with a brief summary of results. It appears to be a thorough piece of work. It is a pity that the laboriousness of such work makes it

distasteful to English students, for to compile a catalogue of this kind is the best possible training in archaeology, being to the special worker what vocal exercises are to the professional singer. Dr. Baur distinguishes, besides two main classes of centaurs, those with human forelegs, and those with equine forelegs, a small third class, that in which human forelegs end in hoofs, and he shows, contrary to the general opinion, that the two main forms are

of almost equal antiquity. He thinks that Greek art accepted the centaur form from the Hittites, to whom horses had long been familiar. At first they appear as merely decorative figures; their connection with myth comes later, and may in most cases arise out of the mere art form. In archaic Greek art the story of Nessus and Heracles is commonest: the woman-stealing raids of the Centaurs which brought them into collision with Theseus and Peirithous are fully illustrated at a later time.

P. GARDNER.

Ἀγράμματοι: *in Aegypto qui litteras sciverint qui nesciverint ex papyris graecis quantum fieri potest exploratur.* E. MAJER-LEONHARD. Frankfort-on-Main: Diekmann. M. 6.

THE author of this book has conceived a very simple idea and carried it out with infinite labour, to the advantage of all those who come after him. It consists of three indices, showing where it is said that another has written for one who cannot write, or where one hand writes, and another signs, or where a person says that he writes with his own hand or can write, or that he writes with difficulty. Finally, these are summed up in lists of the different classes of men who can or cannot write, with all the references. Thirty-six women knew how to write, and 1,940 men; 172 women could not write and 676 men; more classes of men can write than cannot; the number of illiterates increases after the Christian era. Other sidelights on history may be found in this pamphlet that looks so dull and is not dull at all.

W. H. D. R.

L'armée romaine d'Afrique et l'occupation militaire de l'Afrique sous les empereurs. Par RENÉ CAGNAT, Professeur au Collège de France. 2 vols. 4to. Pp. xxviii+423; second vol, 380. with 14 plates, 11 maps and plans. Paris: Imprimerie nationale Ernest Leroux, 1912-13. Fr. 32.

It is unnecessary now to point out to scholars the value of Professor Cagnat's

monograph on the Roman army in Africa, which has ranked as the standard work on this subject, and as one of the most valuable treatises on the military system of the Empire as a whole, ever since its appearance in 1892. The publication of this new edition, enriched by the results of the discoveries and research of the last twenty years, will be equally welcome. The accumulation of new inscriptions, the survey of frontier lines, scientific excavations carried out at the legionary fortress of Lambaesis and elsewhere, the work of scholars on other frontiers, have all combined to widen the field of knowledge and to throw light on points previously obscure. The first part of the new edition contains an account of the wars in Africa under the Empire and of the organisation of the ante-Diocletianic army, the second being devoted to a description of the frontier lines and works and a sketch of the military system prevailing in the fourth century.

The first subject is not perhaps of absorbing interest. The somewhat vain-glorious custom followed by officers of the African army of decorating the streets of their native towns with inscribed stone tablets commemorating their achievements, has resulted in the accumulation of a fair amount of information respecting the endless guerilla wars which harassed the Mauretanian provinces during the third and fourth centuries, but it cannot be said that these documents excite the interest which would attach to similar records from the Rhine or Danube. It was after all not the Berbers or even the Vandals who did the most damage to Roman civilisation in Africa, but Justinian's 'liberating' army, as even Procopius admits: οὕτω τε Λιβύων τοῖς περιγενομένοις, ὀλίγοις τε καὶ λίαν πτωχοῖς οὖσιν, ὅψε καὶ μόλις ἡσυχίαν τινὰ ξυνηνέχθη γενέσθαι. The remaining parts of the book are not only more interesting in themselves, but have gained more from the results of recent archaeological and epigraphical research during the past twenty years. The history of Legio III. Augusta is not only told us in ever-increasing detail by inscriptions, but it has also been possible to recover part of the plan of the fortress of Lam-

baesis in which the legion was stationed during the greater part of the second and third centuries. Some of the conclusions based upon this new evidence are worth noting. Professor Cagnat is, for example, quite clear that the internal arrangements at Lambaesis in the third century show that the troops were still habitually quartered within the walls of the fortress and finds nothing to support the prevailing theory that after the reforms of Septimius Severus the majority of the troops lived with their wives and children in the *canabae*. It must be admitted, however, that parts of the plan are still rather obscure and that further confirmatory evidence would be useful.

More interesting still is the discussion, based upon the researches of Commandant Donau, of the frontier forts and defences in the Tripolitana. A comparison between the new edition and the old shows that real progress is being made towards our knowledge of this remote district. Several of the plans of forts are very striking and show features which would naturally incline English students to an earlier date than that suggested by the epigraphical evidence. The majority of these forts also are too small to hold an entire auxiliary regiment and the troops must have been distributed on principles different to those with which we are familiar on the Rhine and in Britain. Clearly the development of the system of frontier defence did not proceed on identical lines all over the Empire and there is room for much interesting comparative study. English students, who are bent on this purpose, owe a considerable debt to Professor Cagnat for the masterly manner in which the evidence from one part of the Empire is thus presented to them.

G. L. C.

New College, Oxford.

Anonymus de Rebus Bellicis. Von RICHARD NEHER. Tübingen, 1912.

THIS pamphlet of seventy-four pages consists of a survey of all that has been written since the sixteenth century on the curious little illustrated booklet that is found appended to

most copies of the *Notitia Imperii*. A discussion of its worth and contents, and of its exact date, does not form the author's sole purpose. He devotes much space to discussing the various families of MSS. which descend from the lost 'Archetypus.' Nearly all are copies from a Speier manuscript of the tenth or eleventh century; of the fifteen or sixteen which are known about half seem to derive from the Oxford text—a direct transcript of the Speier MS.—which has been visible for so many years among the exhibited books in the Bodleian show-case. The illustrations, always very highly coloured, vary much among themselves; but evidently come from a single prototype, which must itself be a long way from the late Roman original. The strange soldiery exhibited in them look like Carolingian warriors rather than genuine legionaries. Neither their armour nor their poses have a mediaeval cast, and the tenth century seems the most probable date for them.

Herr Neher, rejecting like all other writers (save Schneider) the theory that the *Anonymus* is a forgery of post-Roman date, is inclined to place it a century later than most of its editors, and to think that it has become associated with the *Notitia Imperii* by pure chance. The only surviving copy of it happened—he thinks—to be bound up with that much earlier and more important document, and got transcribed along with it by the merest hazard. He would ascribe it neither to the time of Valens and Valentinian, nor to that of Theodosius and his sons. Rather he pleads for a date somewhere about the time of Anastasius, Justin, or Justinian—preferably for an early year of the last and greatest of those emperors. We cannot say that we are wholly convinced by his arguments in favour of this late date. The sort of army which it presupposes looks more like a fourth century than a sixth century one. But it is difficult to get sufficient internal evidence from a writer who was not a military man but an ingenious 'crank' or inventor, set on recommending to the war-office of his day a number of schemes and devices of which some appear practical but others mere moonshine. No real soldier would have

advocated the reintroduction of scythed chariots! That must have been the idea of an antiquary who had been reading about Arbela!

C. O.

La République Romaine. Les conflits politiques et sociaux. Par. G. BLOCH, Professeur à la Sorbonne. 8vo. (7.3"×4.5"). Pp. 333. Paris: Flammarion, 1913. Fr. 3.50.

IN recent years Continental scholars have been displaying praiseworthy activity in writing popular books on ancient history and culture. The volume before us is a recent addition to the list. It describes in plain language the political and social development of the Romans from the beginning of the long struggle of the lower classes for civil and political equality to the establishment of monarchy; and it is interesting to note that it belongs to a series which very rightly regards *Philosophie scientifique* as embracing the great movements of history no less than the progress of philosophic thought and of scientific knowledge in the narrower sense. Professor Bloch is distinctly successful in the rôle of *vulgarisateur*. His book has the characteristic French qualities of bright style and lucid treatment. Considerable detail is woven into the narrative without impeding its easy flow. The perspective is good: no one factor in development is exaggerated at the expense of others, and the personal element is given due prominence. It is popular work of the right sort, based on sound learning, and characterised by sane judgment. The scholar will not, indeed, always find himself in complete accord with the author. In some matters divergence of view is, of course, inevitable. But there are not a few cases where the author does not seem to have taken account of corrections or modifications of older views suggested by later discussion. Leaving aside smaller points, we may instance the exaggerated weight still attached to the importation of corn into Rome as a factor in the decline of the Italian middle classes, and the not wholly satisfactory accounts of the legislation of the younger Gracchus and the younger Drusus. Such details

do not, however, seriously affect the general merit of the exposition, which can be commended to the attention of those who desire to get a clear survey of the broad lines of development unencumbered by extraneous matter.

J. G. C. ANDERSON.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Cours d'épigraphie latine. RENÉ CAGNAT. 8vo. Pp. xxvii+504. Illustrations: 28 plates and 21 other illustrations. Paris: Fontemoing, 1914.

IT is now nearly 30 years since Professor Cagnat first issued in the *Bulletin Epigraphique* the first draft of his *Cours d'Épigraphie*. A second edition, 'entièrement refondue,' appeared in 1889, a third edition in 1899, and a small supplement in 1904; the fourth edition is now before us. These dates of themselves declare the great value which scholars and students have always attached to the book. Its unflinching lucidity, its great learning, its extraordinary usefulness alike to the beginner and the expert, do not need to be emphasised at this time of day; of it, if of any learned work, it is really true to employ the hackneyed phrase that it should be in every library which recognises classical history and antiquity. In his preface, Professor Cagnat describes this new edition as 'pas une œuvre nouvelle . . . mais une œuvre très sérieusement renouvelée.' It has indeed been carefully revised throughout, errors and misprints corrected, new details inserted, and the text generally brought up to date. As compared with the second edition, which will perhaps be the most familiar to my readers, it has grown from 436 to 488 pages, including the index. The largest increase in any single section occurs in the valuable list of Roman Emperors with the dates of their tribunicia potestas, consulships, etc.; this has grown from 47 to 74 pages, partly by the use of a clearer type and arrangement, and partly by the addition of new matter. In the rest of the volume, the increase of pages is largely due to the very welcome addition of illustrations. One notes also with pleasure that at the end of the whole

work Professor Cagnat has added 28 new plates, containing 86 half-tone illustrations of inscriptions. Of these, some are arranged in chronological order so as to show the styles of lettering which obtained at different periods from the Niger Lapis to the sixth century A.D.; others illustrate varieties of small objects. The important appendix of abbreviations remains at very much its previous length, but rare or doubtful items have been corrected or omitted and a few new items introduced. Altogether, Professor Cagnat has markedly increased the value of what was already an exceedingly good book.

F. H.

The Quinquennales; an historical study.

By RALPH VAN DEMAN MAGOFFIN.
pp. 49. Johns Hopkins University Press, 1913.

DR. MAGOFFIN'S careful examination of the epigraphic evidence as to these officials deserves the thanks of all students of Roman History on its administrative side. He wisely confines his enquiry to the political *quinquennales* with presumably censorial duties. Of these duties however there is, it seems, hardly any evidence in the inscriptions. The suggestion on p. 34 that the title *quinquennalis juvenum* implies a *regimen morum* is very doubtful. Dr. Magoffin has discovered the names of 937 *quinquennales*, among whom there are 62 pairs of colleagues. Of the 937, 251 are *duoviri quinquennales*, while 132 are *quattuorviri quinquennales*. In almost all these, and indeed in the great majority of cases it is clear that these officials were citizens of the towns, and had passed through the municipal *cursus honorum*. The question which troubles Dr. Magoffin about these, is whether they were elected by the towns or appointed by the central government. His conclusion (p. 47) is that at first appointments were made by the central government, that later, candidates suggested by Rome were elected by the towns, and that finally free election became the rule. I cannot here discuss this view, which seems to reverse the order we should expect, but I would suggest that the title '*duovir quinquennalis ex s.c. et d.d.*' only means that

the man was elected *duovir* by the town, and that on a decree of the Roman and local senates he took the census, and assumed the title of *quinquennalis*. It is pretty clear however, from the cases collected by Dr. Magoffin that *quinquennales*, sometimes men with distinguished imperial careers, were often appointed from outside the towns, and that some of these persons held the office, or perhaps only the title, in three or four different towns. These 'ubiquitous office holders' need more discussion than Dr. Magoffin gives them. That the practice of electing emperors or members of the imperial family to this post, involving the discretionary appointment of a *praefectus quinquennalis*, was due to a desire on the part of the towns to avoid having *quinquennales* thrust on them by the central authority, is a suggestion which seems to imply a certain confusion of thought. It is almost inevitable that a minute examination of inscriptions of this kind will raise almost as many questions as it answers, but the questions are themselves useful and suggestive, and to have drawn attention to them is not one of the least merits of Dr. Magoffin's essay.

E. G. HARDY.

Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum: vol. i. fasc. 1. Recensuit Carolus Thulin. Leipzig: Teubner. M. 7.

It is not so long since a writer on early Britain (who shall here be nameless) could state without a twinge of conscience that England was once covered with Roman centuriation, *i.e.*, with the division of land into square plots of two jugera each, a hundred of which plots formed a *centuria*. I mention this to show how little we in Britain know, or used to know, about the Roman *agrimetatio*: for the truth is beyond doubt that *centuriatio* is hardly ever found outside of Italy. I am not sure that Dr. Roby's masterly article in the second edition of the Dictionary of Antiquities was available when the book I speak of was published, and no doubt Lachmann's *Gromatici* was hard for an amateur to understand. There may have been some little excuse for

making this egregious blunder, though not for publishing it abroad.

But there will be no such excuse in the future. Everyone who studies the economic history of the Empire will henceforward have to possess and master the writings of the *agrimensores*, the most important of which are printed in this small handy volume, the first instalment of a Corpus of all these works. We are apt to think of a Corpus as a huge and heavy mass of material; but this is a neat little book which you can put in your pocket and read in the train, amusing yourself with the pictures and plans at the end, which are all derived from the MSS., and are a decided improvement on those reproduced by Lachmann, who frankly owned that they did not interest him. We heartily congratulate both editor and publishers on this substantial benefaction to the world of learning. Dr. Thulin seems to have done his work admirably; he had already made complete preliminary studies, which were noticed in this *Review* for Dec. 1912. He had published under the auspices of the Berlin Academy an exhaustive critical account of the MSS., and here we have a text and apparatus criticus which does much more than merely reproduce those of Lachmann, to whom nevertheless we shall always owe the largest debt of gratitude for his labours in this field.

The works contained in this volume are, first, that of Frontinus, with the commentary of Agennius Urbicus, from which Lachmann so skilfully extracted what we have of the text: this commentary here follows on Frontinus, instead of being printed below his text

as by Lachmann. The order of these remains of Frontinus is slightly changed (see *e.g.* pp. 14 and 16), but references to the paging of Lachmann are always given. Secondly, we have the work of Hyginus, written under Trajan with perhaps some knowledge of Frontinus, but independent of him. He is chiefly occupied, like Frontinus, with explaining the several methods of land-measurement in relation to the nature and quality of the land, and with the *controversiae* that may arise under various circumstances. At the end of the volume will be found the work of another Hyginus (as he seems to be), who lived considerably later, entitled *Constitutio* (limitum). But the question as to the identity of this man is not finally settled. Lastly we have here Sículus Flaccus *De conditionibus agrorum*. This Flaccus is perhaps for the 'ordinary reader' the most interesting of these writers, as he is less technical and more picturesque, and contains some points of interest outside the technicalities of the subject, *e.g.* the religious character of boundaries and the sacrifice to Terminus, on which Rudorff wrote a valuable discussion in the second vol. of the *Gromatici* (p. 236 foll.).

We shall look forward with interest to the appearance of the remainder of Dr. Thulin's undertaking, and may be allowed to hope that it will be provided with a complete index. All questions, historical and other, relating to the distribution of land are of unusual interest to us Britons just now, and all school and college libraries ought to acquire this work.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

NOTES AND NEWS

MR. J. M. EDMONDS has found by a study of the papyrus, on which is written Alcman's *Partheneion*, that both text and scholia have been inaccurately published. Besides new and better readings in 83 ff and 92 ff, he has deciphered a number of scholia hitherto unread, and in particular he has found interlinear notes which had not been

noticed before. The performance appears to have been competitive; Hagesichora was leader and Agido second; and there is no mention of any semi-chorus.

The new Leeds and District Branch of the Classical Association held its first meeting, in the University of

Leeds, on Saturday, March 14. There was a large attendance of members, many of whom had made long journeys in order to be present. The inaugural address was delivered by Professor R. S. Conway. The subject, *Horace as Poet Laureate*, was happily chosen and admirably treated.

The Branch starts with 140 members. Of these, 44 belong to the Branch alone. As many as 96 belong to both the Branch and the Parent Association. The full roll of 140 contains men (100) and women (40), young people (including many past or present students of Leeds University) and old, directors of large firms, lawyers, doctors, engineers, librarians, secretaries, members of Parliament (among them, the Deputy Speaker of the House of Commons), soldiers or ex-soldiers, inspectors or ex-inspectors of schools, experts in science (among these, two distinguished Fellows of the Royal Society) and in music, clergymen (headed by the Archbishop of York), ministers, and teachers. More than 50 new members have been added to the Classical Association through the Branch.

From the Northumberland and Durham Classical Association :

'On February 28 we had a paper by Mr. Bridge, discussing the position of classics in the curriculum of the ordinary secondary school, deploring the practical extinction of Greek and the inadequate time given to Latin.

'The attempts made to improve the teaching of Latin were discussed; the distinction between oral teaching and the attempt to apply the direct method as it is used in modern languages was emphasized.

'The paper was followed by an animated discussion, in which a good many members took part.'

Mr. S. G. Owen writes :

By the death of Professor Harry Langford Wilson, Professor of Roman

Archaeology and Epigraphy in the Johns Hopkins University and President of the Archaeological Institute of America, one of the chief American Latinists has passed away.

Professor Wilson was the author of numerous papers and reviews on learned subjects in the *American Journal of Philology*, the *American Journal of Archaeology*, and the *Classical Weekly*. But what he will be chiefly remembered for is the excellent work which he did on Juvenal. When Mr. Winstedt, in 1899, published in this Review the remarkable fragments of the Sixth Satire, which he discovered in the Bodleian manuscript, question soon arose as to the authenticity of these fragments. English scholars, with commendable judgment, accepted the fragments as the genuine work of Juvenal. But the veteran Bücheler, one of the foremost German Latinists, himself an editor of Juvenal, declared them to be a forgery in language forcible enough, but for reasons hastily assigned, which tended to indicate that he had not properly mastered the meaning of the fragments. Mr. Housman's brilliant translation and elucidation of the verses soon put their genuineness beyond all doubt. What was still wanted was a complete commentary on them. This Professor Wilson supplied in 1901, in the *American Journal of Philology* (XXII., 268-282), which is a fine piece of reasoned and systematic learning. Shortly afterwards, in 1903, he published his edition of Juvenal with a short commentary. This, the most modern, is one of the ablest and most scholarly editions of Juvenal, and is particularly suited for the use of university undergraduates. The full and lucid introduction derives special value from the essay on the style and language of Juvenal, which are here treated more fully than by any other editor. Professor Wilson will be remembered as one who laboured lovingly and fruitfully for the elucidation of Juvenal and of Latin generally.

VERSION

EVENING HYMN.

THE radiant morn hath passed
away,
And spent too soon her golden
store;
The shadows of departing day
Creep on once more.

Our life is but a fading dawn,
Its glorious noon how quickly
past;
Lead us, O Christ, when all is
gone,
Safe home at last.

O by Thy soul-inspiring grace
Uplift our hearts to realms on
high;
Help us to look to that bright
place
Beyond the sky.

Where light, and life, and joy, and
peace
In undivided empire reign,
And thronging angels never cease
Their deathless strain.

Where saints are clothed in spot-
less white,
And evening shadows never fall;
Where Thou, Eternal Light or
Light,
Art Lord of all.

ΕΤΔΟΥΣΙΝ Δ' ΟΡΕΩΝ ΚΟΡΥΦΑΙ.

Ἡοὺς ἀγλαΐη ἀμαθύνεται ἠπιოდώρου,
πρῶτ' τε χρυσαυγούς λῆξ' ἐρατεινὰ βέλλη·
νύξ δὲ περιπροχυθεῖσα θοῇ σκιῇ αμφι-
καλύπτει
γαῖαν ὁμοῦ καὶ ἁλὸς κύματα μαρμαρέης.

ἦύτ' ἄφαρ σβέσθη ἡοὺς ἐρικυδέος αἴγλη,
ἦύτ' ἄφαντος ἔφν δειέλος ὄκα δύνων,
ὥς αἶων φθινύθει· μήκιστ' ἀφικοίμεθ'
ἀκηδῆις,
Χριστέ, τεῇ πομπῇ δώματ' ἐς ἀμβρόσια.

ἴλαθι, ἡμετέρης τε πολυπλάγκτων κραδι-
ῇσιν
ἔμπνει θεσπεσίην, Τρισμακάριστε, χάριν·
αἰεὶ δ' ἄμμι δόμοιο ἐπηράτου, ᾧ ἔνι ναίεις,
αἰθερίοιο ποθὴ κηρόθι μᾶλλον ἔοι.

ἐνθα μὲν εἰρήνη χάρμα ζωὴ τ' ἀτέλευτος
ἄσβεστόν τε φῶς ἐμπέδα πάντα κρατεῖ·
ἐνθα δ' ἀνήριθμοι ἔσαιε κελαδοῦσιν αἰοιδῇ
ἄγγελοι ἀθάνατον, Κοίρανε, Σεῖο κλέος.

γηθοῦσιν δ' ἱεροὶ μάλ' εὐφρονα θυμὸν
ἔχοντες
εἵματά θ' ἐσσάμενοι νηγάτε ἀργύφεια.
οὐ κνέφας οὐ ποτε κείθι· Σὺ γὰρ μακάρεσσι
παναρκῆς
ἀέναόν τε Φῶς ἐπλεο, Παμβασιλεῦ.

A. SHEWAN.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

* * * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Alexander (Leigh). The Kings of Lydia and a Rearrangement of some Fragments from Nicolaus of Damascus. (Dissertation for Doctorate.) 9"×6". Pp. 64. Princeton University, 1913.

American Journal of Philology. Edited by B. L. Gildersleeve. Vol. XXXV. 1, No. 137. Pp. 1-124. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1914.

Bosanquet (Mrs. R. C.) Days in Attica. 9"×6". Pp. xvi+348. Illustrated. Methuen. 7s. 6d. net.

Budde (G.) Chambers's English History. Mit Anmerkungen zum Schulgebranch. 6½"×4". Pp. vi+124. Leipzig: Velhagen and Klasing, 1911. Cloth, M. 1.30.

Burrage (C.) Nazareth and the beginnings of Christianity. 9"×6". Pp. 68. Oxford: University Press, 1914. 3s. 6d. net.

Ceretti (G.) and Sobolevski (S.) Exempla Codicum Graecorum Litteris minusculis scriptorum annorumque notis instructorum. Vol. II., Codices Petropolitani. 21"×16". Leipzig: O. Hassarowitz, 1913. M. 50.

Church Quarterly Review. Edited by the Rev. A. C. Headlam, D.D. Vol. LXXVII., No. 153. April, 1914. 8¾"×5¾". Pp. 1-256. Spottiswoode. 3s.

Clark (A. C.) The Primitive Text of the Gospels and Acts. 9"×6". Pp. viii+112. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Paper boards, 4s. net.

- Clark* (E. C.) Roman Private Law: Jurisprudence. 2 vols. $7\frac{1}{4}'' \times 5''$. Pp. xiv+432 and 433-802. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Collignon* (M.) Le Consul Jean Giraud, et sa relation de l'Attique au XVII^e Siècle. $11'' \times 9''$. Pp. 57. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1913. Fr. 2.60.
- Commentationes philologicae Jenenses*. Vol. XI., fasc. 1 (Thiello). De Glossario Codicis Monac. 14388. $8\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5\frac{3}{4}''$. Pp. 80. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 3.20.
- Cornford* (F. M.) The Origin of Attic Comedy. $9'' \times 6''$. Pp. xii+252. London: Edward Arnold, 1914. Cloth, 8s. 6d.
- Foucart* (P.) Les Mystères d'Éleusis. $10'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 508. Paris: A. Picard, 1914. Fr. 10.
- Galenus* (in Hippocratis de natura hominis, etc.) By J. Mewaldt, G. Helmreich, and J. Westenberger. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xlviii+487. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 20.
- Hardy* (H. H.) The Shorter Aeneid. $7'' \times 4\frac{3}{4}''$. Pp. xxii+212. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Hubbek* (H. M.) The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius, and Aristides. (Dissertation for Doctorate.) $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xii+72. Yale: University Press, 1913.
- Jaeger* (W. W.) Nemesios von Emesa. $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xi+148. Berlin: Weidmann, 1914. M. 5.
- Kern* (O.) Inscriptiones Graecae. $12'' \times 8''$. Pp. xxiv+50 plates. Bonn: Marcus and Weber: Oxford: Parker and Co., 1914. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Landgraf* (G.) Kommentar zu Ciceros Rede Pro Sex. Roscio Amerino. 2te Auflage. $9'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. viii+290. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 8.
- Loeb Classical Library*. St. John Damascene, Barlaam and Joasaph (Mattingley and Woodward), pp. xx+640. Plato (Fowler), Vol. I., pp. xx+584. Dio's Roman History (Cary), Vol. II., pp. vi+519. Tacitus, Dialogus (Peterson), Agricola and Germania (Hutton), pp. 371. $6\frac{1}{2}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$. London: W. Heinemann, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net per vol.
- Liibker* (F.) Reallexikon des Klassischen Altertums (J. Geffcken and E. Ziebarth). $11'' \times 7''$. Pp. xii+1152. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. Cloth, M. 28.
- Maas* (P.) Die neue Responsionsfreiheiten bei Bakchylides und Pindar. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6''$. Pp. 132. Berlin: Weidmann, 1914. M. 0.80.
- Magnus* (H.) P. Ovidi Nasonis Metamorphoseon, Libri XV. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6''$. Pp. xxxiv+766. Berlin: Weidmann, 1914. M. 30.
- Monbrun* (A. de la V.) Maine de Biran (1766-1824) Essai de biographie historique et psychologique. $10'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. viii+544. Paris: Fontemoing and Cie, 1914. Fr. 10.
- Mooney* (W. W.) The House-door on the Ancient Stage. (Doctor's Dissertation.) $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{3}{4}''$. Pp. 108. Baltimore: Wilkins and Wilkins Co., 1914.
- Opitz* (A.) Quaestiones Xenophontae; de Hellenicorum atque Agesilai necessitudine. Philologische Abhandlungen (Förster), 46 Heft. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 88. Breslau: M. and H. Marcus, 1913. M. 3.60.
- Oxyrhynchus Papyri* (Part X.). By B. P. Grenfell and A. S. Hunt. $10'' \times 7\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. xiv+312, with 6 colotype plates. London: Egypt Exploration Fund, 1914. Paper boards, 25s.
- Proceedings of the Classical Association of Ireland*, 1913-14. $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. iv+132. Dublin: Browne and Nolan.
- Raschke* (R.) De Alberto Mythologo. Philologische Abhandlungen (Förster), 45 Heft. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 164. Breslau: M. and H. Marcus, 1913. M. 6.80.
- Schanz* (M.) Geschichte der Römischen Literatur, Achter Band, 4 Teil, 1 Hälfte. Die römische Litteratur von Constantinus bis zum Gesetzbuch Justinians. $10'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xvi+572. München: C. H. Beck, 1914. M. 10.
- Scott* (E. H.) and *Jones* (F.) A Shorter Second Latin Course. $7\frac{1}{4}'' \times 5''$. Pp. xvi+200. London: Blackie and Son, 1913. Cloth, 2s.
- Smyth* (A.) The Composition of the Iliad: an Essay on a Numerical Law in its Structure. $7\frac{3}{4}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. viii+226. London: Longmans and Co., 1914. Cloth, 6s. net.
- Stark* (A. R.) The Christology in the Apostolic Fathers. (Dissertation for Doctorate.) $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 60. University of Chicago Press.
- Sundwall* (J.) Über die vorgriechische linearische Schrift auf Kreta. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. 36. Helsingfors: Centraltryckeri, 1914.
- Taylor* (H. V.) Synthetic Latin Vocabularies. $7'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. vi+96. London: Blackie and Son, 1914. Cloth, 1s.
- The Year's Work in Classical Studies*, 1913. Edited by Cyril Bailey. Eighth year of issue. $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xvi+214. London: John Murray, 1914. 2s. 6d. net.
- Trendelenberg* (A.) Pausanias in Olympia. $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 104, mit einem Plane von Olympia. Berlin: Weidmann, 1914. M. 3.
- Villa Cornelianiana*. A Wall Picture to Illustrate Life on a Roman Estate, designed by E. M. Carter. (Lingua Latina Series.) $40'' \times 60''$, linen, mounted on rollers. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 10s. 6d. net.
- Von Pöhlmann* (R.) Griechische Geschichte. 5te Auflage. $10'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. viii+377. München: C. H. Beck, 1914. M. 6.
- Wagner* (H.) Galeni qui fertur libellus $\epsilon\iota\ \xi\phi\omicron\nu\ \tau\omicron\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\ \gamma\alpha\sigma\tau\rho\acute{\iota}\varsigma$ (Dissertation for Doctorate). $9'' \times 6''$. Pp. xxiv+52. Marburgi Chattorum, MCMXIV; Typis Roberti Noske.
- Waldstein* (Sir C.) Greek Sculpture and Modern Art. $9'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xii+70+78 plates. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Ziebarth* (E.) Aus dem Griechischen Schulwesen. $8\frac{1}{4}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. viii+178. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 5.

The Classical Review

JUNE, 1914

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE ARISTOTELIAN ENTHYMEME.

'WHAT then was an enthymeme? Oxford! thou wilt think us mad to ask. Certainly we knew, what all the world knows, that an enthymeme was understood to be a syllogism of which one proposition is suppressed — major, minor, or conclusion. But what possible relation had *that* to rhetoric? Nature sufficiently prompts all men to that sort of ellipsis; and what impertinence in a teacher to build his whole system upon a solemn precept to do this or that, when the rack would not have forced any man to do otherwise!' So wrote De Quincey eighty-five years ago¹ and proceeded to demonstrate that the enthymeme of Aristotle is something quite different. But as a writer of authority—I mean the late E. M. Cope—has striven to perpetuate the view that the enthymeme of Aristotle is almost² identical with the enthymeme of later times, it cannot be held superfluous to examine the question again.

Aristotle refers much to the enthymeme in the *Rhetoric*, but it is in the *Analytica Priora* (ii. 27) that he gives its formal definition as 'a syllogism from likelihoods or signs' (συλλογισμὸς ἐξ εἰκότων ἢ σημείων), i.e. the enthymeme is a syllogism of a peculiar subject-

matter. Sir William Hamilton, who had already furnished De Quincey with information on the subject, treats the question at some length in two well-known places, viz. the *Edinburgh Review* of April, 1833 (reprinted in his *Discussions*, pp. 153 f.), and in his *Lectures on Logic* (Lect. XX.), and shows that Aristotle meant exactly what he said in his definition. As one of the premisses then of an enthymeme is drawn from 'likelihoods or signs,' its conclusion cannot rise above probability, except in the case where a 'sign' is also an infallible sign or proof, τεκμήριον. The enthymeme, as Aristotle says, is a 'kind of syllogism,' and is naturally much used by orators, who deal extensively in 'likelihoods or signs.' All the references to the enthymeme in Aristotle's *Rhetoric*, and the examples there given, conform to this view and to no other. One of the best accounts of the Aristotelian enthymeme is that of Grant,³ in these words: 'The real characteristic of the "enthymeme" was its suggestive, but non-conclusive, character; for the premisses, even if expressed in full, would not be sufficient to enforce the conclusion which is pointed at.' It is what we call a 'consideration.' 'Let us observe,' he continues, 'some of the enthymemes in the speech of Antony:

¹ *Blackwood's Magazine*, December, 1828.

² I say 'almost' because the enthymeme of later times was not limited to a syllogism 'from likelihoods or signs,' as Cope would of course have limited Aristotle's.

³ *Ancient Classics for English Readers: Aristotle*, p. 81.

1. He hath brought many captives home to Rome,
Whose ransoms did the general coffers fill:
Did this in Caesar seem ambitious?
2. When that the poor have cried, Caesar hath wept;
Ambition should be made of sterner stuff.
3. You all did see, that on the Lupercal
I thrice presented him a kingly crown,
Which he did thrice refuse. Was this ambition?

These three arguments are based on "signs"; acts of Caesar are adduced as showing in him a disinterestedness, a tenderness of heart, and a modesty which would be incompatible with selfish ambition. But the reasoning is not conclusive, since the acts mentioned might have flowed from other sources than good qualities of the heart; they might have been done "with a motive." However, there is fully as much cogency here as can ordinarily be expected to be found in the deductions of an orator.¹ It is obvious that, as Thomson remarks, 'several concurrent enthymemes are often as cogent as a demonstrative syllogism,' and that 'circumstantial evidence falls naturally into a series of enthymemes,'² and it *may* happen, as above remarked, and as Aristotle points out,³ that an enthymeme is also a valid syllogism.

It is well known that later writers, Greek and Roman, used the word 'enthymeme' in quite a different sense from Aristotle's—indeed in various senses—three of which are mentioned by Quintilian,⁴ but the meaning of the word in modern⁴ as well as medieval writers is 'a syllogism with one premiss suppressed,' and it is so defined in Murray's dictionary.⁵ This also is the sense which Cope attributes to the word in Aristotle (with the understood limitation referred to in note 1 above). In his text, it is true, he adopts the view of Hamilton, but reverses his own decision in a note with the remark that the view given in

the text 'was adopted mainly in deference to the decided opinion expressed by Sir William Hamilton.'⁶ It is often said that the important part of a lady's letter is to be found in the postscript, but I have never heard that the important part of a scholar's exposition is to be found in the note. Most of this note requires to be transcribed verbatim in order that we may do justice to its merits. After the sentence above quoted Cope continues: 'I am now however, convinced that he is wrong, and return to the opinion which I had myself previously formed upon the question. If the only difference between the rhetorical enthymeme and the syllogism lay in the probability of the one and the certainty of the other, it would leave no distinction remaining between the dialectical syllogism and the rhetorical enthymeme: besides which the position is not true of the dialectical syllogism, whose materials and conclusions are all probable and nothing more. Plainly the difference between the two latter is one of *form*. The syllogism is complete in all its parts; the enthymeme incomplete; one of the premisses or the conclusion is *invariably* wanting. If further proof were needed, it would be found in this, that the relation of the example to induction is precisely similar. The example is an incomplete induction: a general inference derived from a *single instance*, instead of being collected from an exhaustive assemblage of similar instances. Again the argument, that a syllogism from probabilities expressed at full length would be just as much an enthymeme as the incomplete one, rests upon an utterly unfounded assumption, which assumes the theory to be proved, and presents us with another of those *petitiones principii* for which Sir W. Hamilton has lately become so famous (see Mill's Examination).' This note is liable to the following observations:

(1) In the statement that if Hamilton's view is correct 'it would leave no distinction between the dialectical syllogism and the rhetorical enthymeme' Cope appears to confound valid with

¹ *Laws of Thought*, pp. 247, 248.

² *Rhet.*, 1. 2. 14.

³ *V. 10.*, §§ 1, 2.

⁴ *E.g.*, Whately, Thomson, Jevons, Joseph.

⁵ Or, instead of one premiss, the conclusion may be suppressed.

⁶ *Introduction to Aristotle's Rhetoric*, p. 103 and note.

invalid inference. The syllogism framed from 'likelihoods or signs' may be valid or it may be invalid. In the first case it is also a dialectical syllogism, in both cases it is an enthymeme. Let us take an example of an enthymeme 'from likelihoods' given by Clarke.¹

Fat men are good-natured ;
Horace was a fat man ;
∴ Horace was good-natured.

This is in form a syllogism of the first figure, but it is invalid because the middle term, 'fat men,' being equivalent to 'most fat men' is undistributed. The only valid inference from the given premisses is that Horace was probably good-natured, a conclusion which is not of sufficient importance for the orator. The thing to be particularly noticed is not that no valid inference can be drawn from 'likelihoods or signs,' but that the valid inference is generally useless, while the inference that is of importance to the speaker is not valid. Aristotle gives as an enthymeme from signs, 'This is a sign that he has a fever, he breathes quick.'² The syllogism here is of the second figure, in which the middle term is the predicate of both premisses :

Those who have a fever breathe quick ;
A. breathes quick ;
∴ A. has a fever.

The syllogism is invalid because in this figure one premiss, and consequently the conclusion, must be negative, which is not the case here. It is, however, a good enthymeme. If the sign is an infallible sign (*τεκμήριον*), as in the example of Aristotle, 'She is a mother, for she has milk,' we have a syllogism of the first figure which is valid and is therefore a dialectical syllogism. The syllogism here is :

All who have milk are mothers ;
A. has milk ;
∴ A. is a mother.

The dialectical syllogism is a valid syllogism, the rhetorical syllogism or enthymeme is invalid, with the exception above named, and this corresponds with the distinction between dialectic

and rhetoric, the aim of the former being to demonstrate, of the latter to induce belief. The enthymeme is often called a 'rhetorical syllogism,' but there may be enthymemes which are not rhetorical. The definition of an enthymeme being that it is a syllogism from 'likelihoods' or 'signs,' enthymemes may have their premisses drawn from particular sciences, such as medicine. Thus in the example: 'This is a sign that he has a fever, he breathes quick,' the enthymeme is not rhetorical.

(2) It is incorrect to say of the dialectical syllogism that 'its materials and conclusions are all probable and nothing more.' It is true that Aristotle does not identify dialectic with logic, as we often do. He distinguishes between dialectic as an art, in which premisses are drawn from any subject-matter, and scientific proof, where we have to do with premisses drawn from particular sciences. But the syllogism is, according to Aristotle, the universal instrument of reasoning, and every valid syllogism, whatever the subject-matter of its premisses, may be called a dialectical syllogism. Whether the premisses are in themselves true or not, is of no consequence to dialectic, though of the utmost importance to science.

(3) Before considering the main position of Cope—that the difference between the enthymeme and the dialectical syllogism (or syllogism simply) is that the former is complete in form and the latter incomplete—it may be as well to deal with the remainder of the quotation. He says: 'The relationship of the example to induction is precisely similar, the example is an incomplete induction'; and, two pages on, further explains in a short paragraph, 'As the enthymeme is an imperfect syllogism, so is the example an imperfect induction: the former omits either premiss or the conclusion; the latter instead of collecting its universal from all the known and accessible instances, contents itself with one or two, from which the universal is inferred.' But clearly the imperfection of the example is a different kind of imperfection from that of the enthymeme. The example is materially imperfect, while the enthymeme is, according to Cope, only formally imperfect,

¹ *Logic*, by R. F. Clarke, p. 357.

² *Rhet.* i. 2. 18.

and the better conclusion from the comparison is that, as the example is a materially imperfect induction, so the enthymeme is a materially imperfect syllogism. That Cope does not appreciate this is surprising. Finally, Cope seems to be utterly mistaken in writing, 'Again the argument, etc.' (the last sentence of the note quoted above). This is not an 'argument' used by Sir W. Hamilton; it is a statement of the conclusion from his arguments, and there is no *petitio principii* whatever.

Now we come to the Aristotelian statements in the *Rhetoric* which prove that Cope's view of the nature of the enthymeme is erroneous. It has already been seen that the definition in the *Anal. Prior.* gives no countenance to Cope. The passages in the *Rhetoric* are well set out and explained by Mr. G. M. Edwards in his review of Welldon's *Translation of the Rhetoric*,¹ but he might have said a good deal more than, 'the alternative opinion (*i.e.* Hamilton's) deserves at least a mention,' when he succeeds in proving that it is correct. The passages are (I give Jebb's translation):—

(1) i. 2. 13. 'Hence both the enthymeme and the example must deal with things which are (as a rule) contingent—the example, as a kind of induction, the enthymeme as a syllogism, and as a syllogism of few elements—often, of fewer than the normal syllogism (τὸ δ' ἐνθύμημα συλλογισμόν, καὶ ἐξ ὀλίγων τε καὶ πολλάκις ἐλαττόνων ἢ ἐξ ὧν ὁ πρῶτος συλλογισμός).' This is fatal to Cope's contention, who is reduced to the explanation that here *πολλάκις* means 'always.' In fact the syllogism, as well as the enthymeme, has usually one of its premisses suppressed, except in formal treatises. The distinction made by Cope would, as Hamilton says, 'involve a discrimination of species between the reasoning of logic and the reasoning of ordinary discourse' that would not have been sanctioned by Aristotle, who wrote 'syllogism and demonstration belong not to the outward discourse but to the discourse which passes in the mind (οὐ

πρὸς τὸν ἕξω λόγον ἢ ἀπόδειξις ἀλλὰ πρὸς τὸν ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ· ἐπεὶ οὐδὲ συλλογισμός).'²

(2) In ii. 21. 6. Aristotle says, 'Of the maxims that have a reason added (*γνώμαι μετ' ἐπιλόγου*), some are part of an enthymeme, others are in the nature of enthymemes, but not part of an enthymeme,' while in § 2 he has already said, 'when the cause, the *wherefore*, is added, it is the complete enthymeme.' That is, he calls the same thing, first, a 'complete enthymeme' and then 'part of an enthymeme.' Cope says this is 'careless writing,' and it certainly is that in any case, but with Cope's interpretation of the word 'enthymeme' it is inexplicable, and he flounders badly in the attempt to reconcile the two remarks. If it is of the essence of the enthymeme that one premiss should always be suppressed, how is it possible, even for Aristotle, to call a syllogism with one premiss suppressed 'part of an enthymeme?' If, on the other hand, it is a syllogism 'from likelihoods or signs' which may have, and nearly always does have, one premiss suppressed, then it may be said that in § 2 Aristotle is regarding the enthymeme as it nearly always is in fact, and in § 6 as it is in theory.

(3) In i. 1. 11., after saying that the enthymeme is a 'sort of syllogism (*συλλογισμός τις*),' Aristotle goes on, 'Hence it is clear that he who is best able to investigate the elements and the genesis of the syllogism will also be the most expert with the enthymeme, when he has further mastered its subject-matter and its differences from the logical syllogism.' If, however, Cope is right in his view that there is *no* difference of subject-matter between the syllogism and the enthymeme, the above sentence is devoid of meaning. Aristotle *defines* an enthymeme as a 'syllogism from likelihoods or signs,' so that if, as Hamilton remarks, 'he over and above discriminated them by an accident of form, he would divide the genus by two differences and differences also of a merely contingent association.'

The distinction between 'likelihoods'

¹ *Classical Review*, i., p. 98 f.

² *Anal. Post.*, i. 10. 7.

and 'signs' is not always easy to maintain. A likelihood is a proposition stating what is generally esteemed true, what is true for the most part though not always, as, 'Suffering improves the character,' or, 'Fat men are good-natured.' A sign is a term used to point to something else—evidence of some further fact, as, 'Quickness of breathing is a sign of feverishness,' the sign here being the predicate of the proposition, 'Those who have a fever breathe quickly.' If the sign can be made the subject of the proposition it is an infallible sign or proof, as 'All who have milk are mothers,' or, 'All who are feverish are ill,' in other words, the possession of milk is a proof of motherhood, feverishness is a proof of illness. With all respect to Jebb, he appears to be mistaken in classifying propositions from *εἰκότα* as 'general' and propositions from *σημεῖα* as 'particular,' for both may be general—e.g. the proposition 'Fat men are good-natured' may be regarded as one from 'signs' as easily as one from 'likelihoods.'

The exposition of Cope on the two kinds of signs—(1) the sign which is as a particular to a universal, and (2) the sign which is as universal to particular, is, I venture to think, mistaken. Aristotle gives as an example of (1) 'Wise men are just; for Socrates was wise and just,' which in form makes a syllogism of the third figure, but one which is refutable inasmuch as by that figure no general conclusion can be drawn. As an example of (2) Aristotle gives, 'This is a sign he has a fever, he breathes quick,' which in form makes a syllogism of the second figure, but is refutable because the second figure can only prove a negative conclusion. Between (1) and (2) Aristotle has two examples of a sign which is a strict proof, or *τεκμήριον*—viz. 'Here is a sign that he is ill—he is feverish,' and 'She is a mother, for she has milk.' In which of the two kinds of signs does Aristotle include the *τεκμήριον*? Cope places the *τεκμήριον* under (1) and it must be admitted that Aristotle's language favours this view, but surely, as the conclusion is a particular one, not general, it must come under (2). The

conclusion that A. is ill because he is feverish is just as particular as the conclusion that he has a fever because he breathes quick, although in the former case the feverishness is an infallible sign, or proof, of illness, whereas quick breathing is not an infallible sign of fever. How then is an infallible sign or proof to be distinguished from a fallible sign? The answer is, simply by a previous induction. We know, and can only know, by induction that fever is a proof of illness, also by induction that quick breathing, though a sign, is not an infallible sign, of fever; no logical process alone can distinguish a *τεκμήριον* from a mere *σημεῖον*. Cope, however, takes as the test of a *τεκμήριον* that the terms of the proposition should be convertible. He says, 'fever and hard-breathing are not co-extensive: and therefore a sign of this kind is always capable of refutation.' But he is clearly mistaken, for fever and illness are not 'co-extensive'; a man may be ill without being feverish, and yet fever as a sign of illness is a *τεκμήριον* and not 'capable of refutation.' If a sign is a *τεκμήριον* what we can say about it is, that it will make a syllogism of the first figure.¹

Sir William Hamilton has drawn out an elaborate table to mark the various meanings of *ἐνθύμημα*, but the following is sufficient for the present purpose. In Sophocles, Xenophon, Isocrates, we find the word used for a deliberate thought, plan, suggestion of any kind. In the *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, which is a little earlier than Aristotle's, and anciently attributed to him, we find the word used in a technical sense, not as one of the two kinds of rhetorical proof, but as a species of proof among other special classes of arguments, viz. 'a proof drawn from any kind of opposition (*οὐ μόνον τὰ τῷ λόγῳ καὶ τῇ πράξει ἐναντιούμενα ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις ἅπασιν*).'² Cicero, while admitting that every kind of thought may be called *ἐνθύμημα*, says that in rhetoric it is confined to arguments *ex contrariis conclusa*,³ 'a reasoning from

¹ Cope, *loc. cit.*, pp. 164, 165; *Ar. Rhet.* i. 2. 18.

² *Rhet. ad Alex.*, c. 10.

³ *Topica*, § 55. See Reid on *pro Sulla*, § 32.

contraries.' Quintilian names the two meanings assigned by Cicero, but also gives *sententia cum ratione*,¹ 'a maxim with a reason attached,' which is indeed the same as Aristotle's *γνώμη μετ' επιλόγου*. He goes on, 'Hunc alii *rhetoricum syllogismum*, alii *imperfectum syllogismum* vocaverunt, quia nec distinctis nec totidem partibus concluderetur; quod sane non utique ab oratore desideratur.' Here we have the full-blown doctrine that the enthymeme is *imperfectus syllogismus*, and this doctrine is that of late Greek and Latin rhetoricians and medieval writers in general. The statement in Liddell & Scott s.v. *ἐνθύμημα*, which is correct about Aristotle's use of the word, that 'the common account that it is a *syllogism with one premiss suppressed* is much later' (i.e. than Quintilian) cannot be supported. Hamilton attributes to Rodolphus Agricola (d. 1485) the first correct interpretation of Aristotle. However, St. Thomas Aquinas, two hundred years earlier than Rodolphus, as Clarke remarks, gave the true Aristotelian teaching. It may be found in his commentary on *Anal. Post.* in these words:

'Manifestat idem in rhetoricis, in quibus persuasio fit per enthymema aut per exemplum; non autem per syllogismum vel inductionem completam, propter incertitudinem materiae circa quam versatur scilicet circa actus singulares hominum, in quibus universales propositiones non possunt assumi vere. Et ideo loco syllogismi, in quo necesse est esse aliquam universalem, aliquo enthymemate; et similiter loco inductionis, in qua concluditur universale, aliquo exemplo, in quo proceditur a singulari, non ad universale, sed ad singulare. Unde patet quod sicut enthymema est quidem syllogismus detruncatus, ita exemplum est quaedam inductio imperfecta. Si ergo in syllogismo et inductione proceditur ex aliquo praecognito, oportet idem intelligi in enthymemate et exemplo.'²

In this passage St. Thomas writes of the syllogism and the enthymeme as differing in *matter*, and when he calls the enthymeme 'syllogismus detrunc-

catus,' he is referring to *that* difference, not to a difference of form. The credit of correctly interpreting Aristotle is generally given to Pacius (1550-1635) who, on the authority of four Greek MSS first ejected *ἀτελής* as a gloss from *Anal. Prior.* ii. 27, *συλλογισμὸς ἀτελής ἐξ εἰκότων ἢ σημείων*. It is now accepted that *ἀτελής* is spurious. Facciolati, in 1724, expanded the view of Pacius. Modern writers on Logic correctly distinguish the current meaning of 'enthymeme' from that which it bears in Aristotle. Cope and Grote alone, as far as I know, maintain that the distinction between Aristotle's enthymeme and the syllogism is merely one of form, and Grote professes to be following Cope. Jebb, in his *Attic Orators*,³ agrees with Hamilton. Sir John Sandys, in his edition of Cope's *Arist. Rhet.* and of Jebb's *Translation* expresses no opinion of his own, but he has recently informed me that he now holds that Hamilton's view is the only view that can be made to suit Aristotle's own language.

It is generally considered, I believe, that the mistaken view of Aristotle's meaning is due to the interpolation *ἀτελής* referred to above, but, if so, how is the interpolation to be accounted for? Mansel calls it 'a clumsy one, designed to accommodate Aristotle's definition to subsequent views of the nature of the enthymeme, and made by a scribe not particularly well versed in Aristotelian phraseology.'⁴ But then how did these subsequent views of the nature of the enthymeme arise? I am inclined to think that the explanation is easier. *ἀτελής* was probably an interpolation, but an early one, and may have been inserted by some one quite well versed in Aristotelian phraseology. According to Aristotle the syllogism is only 'perfect,' *τέλειος*, when it is of the first figure, because he looked on that as a peculiarly evident and cogent form of argument. The second and third figures of the syllogism he considered to be 'imperfect' because they are not immediately evident by the *dictum de omni et nullo*. A scribe might therefore very

¹ V. 10. 1.

² Ed. Vatic., i., p. 141.

³ Vol. ii., p. 289.

⁴ Mansel's *Aldrich*, Appendix F.

well insert the word ἀτελής after συλλογισμός inasmuch as the enthymeme, being 'from likelihoods or signs' would never form a συλλογισμός τέλειος except in the case of a sign being also a proof (τεκμήριον). This word ἀτελής might soon be misunderstood to have reference, not to the matter, but to the form of the enthymeme, and this misunderstanding would be aided by the fact that, as might be expected, all the enthymemes given by Aristotle, by way

of example, are ἀτελής in both senses. The transition from an 'imperfect' syllogism drawn from 'likelihoods or signs' to any 'imperfect' syllogism, whatever its subject-matter, would present little difficulty, and it would become established that an enthymeme is a syllogism with either premiss, or even with the conclusion, suppressed.

R. C. SEATON.

Reigate.

NOTE ON CULEX—LINES 24-41.

IN this note I assume two things: (1) that the poem is an early work of Virgil. This seems to me to have been proved by Miss Jackson in her paper in the *Classical Quarterly* of 1911, p. 163 foll. (2) That the Octavius to whom the poem is dedicated was the future Augustus. There is one other possible candidate for the honour (see Leo's edition, p. 22), but there is an almost universal agreement that the language of these lines forbids us to think of any boy but the nephew of Julius. I use Ellis' text: fortunately the words on which I wish to lay stress are not doubtful, as are some others. Lastly, my object in venturing into a thorny path was to see if I could independently find any evidence of the date of the poem.

In these lines the poet asks Octavius to aid his efforts, *i.e.* to accept a dedication for a reason on which he lays stress, *viz.* that war is not the theme of the poem:

Et tu cui meritis oritur fiducia chartis
Octaui uenerande, meis adlabere coeptis,
sancte puer, tibi namque canit non pagina bellum
triste Iouis. . . .

No wars, either mythological or historical, are the subject of the poem,

Mollia sed tenui decurrere carmina uersu
uiribus acta suis Phoebo duce ludere gaudent.

Such a homely theme as mine, he says, will suffice for Octavius:

Haec tibi, sancte puer, memorabimus, haec tibi
restet
gloria perpetuum lucens mansura per aevum.

et tibi sede pia maneat locus, et tibi sospes
debita felices memoretur uita per annos,
grata, bonis lucens. Sed nos ad coepta feramur.

All this seems to me to suggest that Octavius was very young, a *puer* in the strict sense of the word. He is asked to accept the poem because the theme is not warlike but homely. His whole life is before him: he has as yet done nothing heroic, and is, indeed, not of an age to listen to tales of war and bloodshed; nay, the poet seems indirectly to suggest a hope that he may live to be a man of peace. I cannot think that such a poem, with such a dedication, could have been addressed to Octavius after he had taken his toga virilis. That event took place on October 18, 48 B.C., when the boy was just fifteen (see *Feriale Cumanum* in *C.I.L.*, vol. i., ed. 2, p. 229). His uncle from this time evidently destined him for a military life; after the African war (47-46) Suetonius tells us that he was 'donatus militaribus donis' in Caesar's triumph, though too young to take part in the campaign. In the Spanish war that followed he took part, though hindered by illness; and then he was sent to Apollonia to be ready for the impending Parthian campaign, as well as to continue his studies. Thus it is most unlikely that the *Culex* could have been dedicated to him in these years after 48; if we think of its peculiarly homely character, and the fact that it was addressed to this boy just because it was homely and not warlike, we seem debarred from any other conclusion.

The times were not such as to suggest the dedication of such a poem to a youth now entering on manhood, and destined to share Caesar's campaigns. I conclude therefore that it must have been written and dedicated before the end of 48 B.C.

But if we are driven to put the poem in the earlier years of Octavius, when he was still *praetextatus*, do the epithets *uenerande* and *sancte* (the latter occurring twice), suit such a boy? I think they do: I believe that he is *sanctus* and *uenerandus* mainly as being in the quasi-sacred condition implied by the toga praetexta. Two years ago there appeared at Königsberg a careful inquiry into the meaning of the word *sanctus*, or rather, into the gradual development of its meanings. The author, Dr. Link, believes its primary meaning to be 'inviolable,' as the result of common opinion or public authority; thus a wall, a spring, a puteus, might be held in awe and regarded as *sanctus*, though not actually made over to the gods as *sacer*. In this conclusion I have little doubt that he is right. He also thinks that the word *uenerandus*, often combined with *sanctus*, only expresses another side of the same meaning; the spirit or numen supposed to reside in a spot reckoned *sanctus* would naturally suggest reverence or even worship. Later on the word *sanctus* is transferred to certain human beings, because they had to do with worship and their persons were inviolable; and with it we still occasionally find the word *uenerandus*. Strange to say, our passage has escaped his notice, or he might have been led on to note the *sanctitas* of Roman children, who wore the same toga as priests and magistrates. I gave reasons for associating the idea of the inviolability of children with the toga praetexta in *Classical Review*, vol. x, p. 317 foll.

It may possibly be objected here that in *Aen.* ix, 276 Ascanius, a young boy beyond doubt, calls Euryalus, who was older than himself (not less than sixteen or seventeen as we may suppose), 'uenerande puer.' But (1) Ascanius is here taking Euryalus as a kind of patronus in a charming boyish way (see Skutsch's note in *Aus Vergil's Frühzeit*, p. 131, note 2), and the word

uenerandus is perfectly natural and without any special sense; (2) he does *not* use the word *sanctus*, which would hardly have been natural to the younger boy when addressing the elder, who was just about to slay and be slain in a bloody struggle. So at least I feel it. There is no analogy between the two cases: in the *Culex* the boy addressed is the younger, innocent of war and bloodshed; in the Ninth *Aeneid* the boy addressed is the elder, and at that moment armed and ready for the fray.

Though I maintain that the epithets *sanctus* and *uenerandus* are mainly suggested by the tender age and innocence of the boy, I am ready to accept the view that they are rendered still more appropriate by the fact that this boy was the nephew of the governor of Cisalpine Gaul, to whom the Transpadani, with the poet's family beyond doubt among them, had long been looking up as their political champion. (For the circumstances connected with this attitude of theirs I may refer to Dr. E. G. Hardy's recent article on the Transpadani and Novum Comum in the *Journal of Philology*, vol. xxiii. 103 foll.). But I lay less stress on this point than on the fitness of these epithets for a really young boy, who had as yet had no experience of war, and who might be expected to be pleased with such a poem as the *Culex*.

If we could be sure that the two boys had already met when the dedication was written, we should also be justified in seeing a characteristic Virgilian tenderness in these words; for Octavius, if we may trust the famous bust, was a beautiful and discreet boy, and the poet's love for all young creatures was so marked as to suggest a scandal to the gossips of a later day; Euryalus, Lausus, Pallas—has any poet ever touched with such pure tenderness of feeling the most beautiful types of boyhood in portraits such as these? I am inclined to think that Virgil and Octavius may actually have met in the year 50 B.C., when the elder was about twenty and the younger thirteen. At the end of the eighth book of the *De Bello Gallico* Hirtius tells us that Caesar came to Cisalpine Gaul early in that year, and was busy canvassing in the province on

behalf of Antony in his candidature for the augurship;¹ also that he was received in the Transpadane part of the province, to which the poet's family belonged, with great acclaim, and was fêted wherever he went.² We are not told that he summoned his nephew from Rome to spend the summer with him; historians and biographers would not have taken much notice of a praetextatus even in such company. But Octavius was the one hope of the family, and Romans like Cicero and Caesar felt tenderly towards the boys in whom they placed their hopes, and wished to see them after long absence, like our Indian parents of to-day. It is pleasant to think it quite possible that Virgil may have seen Octavius at Mantua, or even talked with him. In any case, I would suggest that this year 50 B.C. is a likely one for the date of the dedication, though the poem as a whole may have been composed earlier, perhaps when the lad Virgil was only sixteen, as Donatus tells us in his life of the poet. Certainly I cannot persuade myself that either the poem or the dedication was written after Octavius had taken his toga virilis in October 48 B.C.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

P.S.—Dr. Warde Fowler has been so kind as to show me this article at an early stage; indeed it is at my earnest request that he has now sent it to the *Classical Review*. I have asked his kind permission to append one or two notes which seem to me, so far as they go, confirmation of his illuminating suggestion.

(1) In the first place we have got to account for the fact that somehow or other Vergil was sufficiently well known to Octavian to have his farm restored to him in 41 B.C. in the teeth of the

agreement with Antony. This will become clear at once if we suppose that Octavian, when merely a boy, had become attached to Vergil, for then all that would be needed would be for Pollio or Varus to inform Octavian who it was that was being turned out of the Mantuan estate.

(2) It seems to me most probable, indeed almost necessary, to suppose that in the Transpadane country Caesar would have met so able and important a landowner as Vergil's father. Anyone who has been at Pietole must realise what a sweep of country is described in the Ninth Eclogue, 7-9³). Speaking from memory I should think that this would mean an extent of not less than ten miles at whatever point of the compass the *colles* may be located. The support of such a man, especially as his prosperity⁴ was not more conspicuous than his knowledge of agriculture and of bee-keeping, and his enthusiasm for culture, was just such a source of strength as the enlightened Julius would be most anxious to draw to his own side, and knowing what we do of the relation between Vergil and his father, from almost every book of the *Aeneid*, who can doubt that the old man would have seized every opportunity of putting the shy and lovable genius of his son into as close touch as he could with the great and godlike patron of the Transpadanes?

(3) But I write this note mainly to add, with Professor W. R. Hardie's kind permission, what seemed to me an important and interesting suggestion which he recently made to me in commenting upon a lecture on the Fourth Book of the *Aeneid* given to the Classical Association of Scotland last December. Professor Hardie asks whether we may not reasonably believe that Vergil was a friend also of Octavia, the Emperor's

¹ *De Bello Gall.* VIII. c. 50. Caesar heard on his way that Antony *had been* elected, but visited the towns all the same to thank them for their support.

² *B.G.* VIII. 51. Exceptus est Caesaris adventus ab omnibus municipiis et coloniis incredibili honore atque amore. . . . Nihil relinquebatur quod ad ornatum portarum, itinerum, locorum omnium, qua Caesar iturus erit, excogitari poterat. *Cum liberis omnis multitudo obviam procedebat*, etc.

³ qua se subducere colles incipiunt, mollique iugum demittere cliuo, usque ad aquam et ueteres, umbrosa cacumina, fagos, omnia carminibus vestrum seruasse Menalcas.

⁴ Quidam opificem figulum, plures Magi, cuiusdem viatoris initio mercennarium mox ob industriam generum tradiderunt, egregieque substantiae silvis coemendis et apibus curandis auxisse reculam (Donat. *vit. Verg.* § 1).

sister. This would partly account for the great prominence given to the death of her son Marcellus in the sixth book of *Aeneid*, the conclusion of which as we all know, was read to the bereaved mother herself. Professor Hardie was also inclined to develop a suggestion made in the lecture that in drawing the picture of Dido Vergil may have had in mind the unhappiness caused in the life of Octavia (as well as of other high-born women in the Imperial circle) by the influence of politics on their different marriages. Professor Hardie writes:

'It may have been Vergil's acquaintance with Octavia that enabled him to imagine the feelings of a woman like Dido and to draw a picture so different from that which Apollonius gives us of the parting of Jason and Hypsipyle. There was no danger that his Dido would be taken for a portrait of Octavia (which, further, would have involved identifying Aeneas with Antony). The circumstances were too different. Dido put at the service of Aeneas the resources of the city she had founded. Octavia carried money and troops to the East for Antony (in 35 B.C.). Octavia must have had at one time some affection for Antony and her whole treatment of him was clearly magnanimous if our authorities can be trusted.'

He points also, though with very just reserve, to a sentence in the *Vita Monacensis* of Vergil (Diehl *Vitae Vergilianae*, p. 46) *Hic* (i.e. Augustus) *Antonio, consulisuo* (?) . . . *dedit sororem suam coniugem, sub cuius potestate Virgilius erat*. The statement that Vergil was in some way under the influence of Octavia may not have been merely invented, though as the word preceding *dedit* (*Monachim*) is unintelligible, and this 'Life' is marked by many fables, it is difficult to build very much upon the whole passage. But I would point out further that Vergil was certainly in close touch with the Imperial, or almost Imperial, family in the years immediately preceding Octavia's final separation from Antony, as the Fourth Eclogue, written in 40 B.C., sufficiently shows.

(4) It should be pointed out that the evidence, which to my mind as to Dr. Warde Fowler's is already conclusive for the authenticity of the *Culex*, is now further confirmed by the metrical analysis of caesurae by Mr. W. G. D. Butcher in the current number of the *Classical Quarterly* (April, 1914, p. 128); also on other metrical grounds by Lederer in his pamphlet *Ist Vergil der Verfasser von Cris und Culex*?

(5) It must now be pointed out that if, as can hardly be doubted, the date which Dr. Warde Fowler suggests for the poem, viz. 48 B.C., is correct, it follows that the numerous resemblances between it and the undoubted poems of Vergil (all later than that date) which Miss Jackson pointed out, resemblances some 80 in number, cannot be due to imitation of Vergil by the author of the *Culex*, but must imply an intimate acquaintance with the *Culex* on the part of Vergil himself. It may reasonably be asked of those who think that the poem is quite unworthy of Vergil—as, of course, it is unworthy of his maturity—whether he would have been likely to give such careful attention to such a poem—so careful, in fact, as to have almost learnt it by heart. The kind of resemblance that seems to me most striking evidence of this familiarity are such parallels as

<i>Culex</i> 240	with	<i>Aen.</i> 6. 374.
„ 262	„ „	7. 337.
„ 222	„ „	10. 396.
„ 354-5	„ „	11. 260.
„ 202	„ „	<i>Ecl.</i> 6. 86.
„ 62	„ „	<i>Georgics</i> 2. 465.

Altogether it appears to me that the picture which Dr. Warde Fowler conjures up of the big boy Vergil taking the little boy Octavius round the great Mantuan farm and showing him, to their common delight, all the creatures and places to which he himself was equally attached as boy, farmer and poet, is one of the probabilities far too good not to be true.

R. S. C.

Manchester, April, 1914.

NOTE ON POLYBIUS III. 47-50, AND LIVY XXI. 31, 32.

THE question of Hannibal's route through the Alps depends in part upon the interpretation of Polybius III. 47-50, and of Livy XXI, 31 and 32. I gave in 1911 an account of the route, which seems to me best to accord with the narratives of Polybius and Livy, and I propose now to supplement it by a close examination of the ancient description of one part of the route. I assume that the words of Polybius 42. 1, *εὐθέως ἐνεχέειρει ποιεῖσθαι τὴν διάβασιν κατὰ τὴν ἀπλὴν ῥύσιν*, imply that the crossing of the Rhone took place about Fourques, just above the head of the Delta. I think that the words *σχεδὸν ἡμερῶν τεττάρων ὁδὸν ἀπέχων στρατοπέδῳ τῆς θαλάττης* cannot be intended to convey an exact distance, and are an anticipatory reference to the four days on the first of which Scipio left his fleet to reach Hannibal's empty camp on the fourth. When his infantry and cavalry had crossed the Rhone Hannibal assembled the army and made a speech. Next day, while he was getting the elephants across the Rhone, he set his infantry in march and then followed with the elephants as rear-guard, moving beside the river eastwards away from the sea towards Central Europe.

Here Polybius describes the Rhone and the Alps. The Rhone flowed westwards through a defile, of which the south side was formed by the northern slope of the Alps, whose mass lies between the Rhone Valley and the plain of the Po. Hannibal's route took him through these Alps, from the Rhone Valley to Italy. In 39 Polybius has divided the journey into stages: the second from the crossing of the Rhone, along that river to the ascent of the Alps towards Italy, 1,400 stadia (154 miles), and the third the passage of the Alps, 1,200 stadia (132 miles). This means that Hannibal marched 154 miles along the Rhone Valley, the *αὐλὼν*, that when he left the *αὐλὼν* he was entering the Alps, and that the 132 miles are the distance by his route from the Alpine edge of that valley to the entrance to the plain of the Po.

Then comes a digression on the

pains with which Hannibal had studied the country in advance and planned his march, ending with the statement that Polybius had himself followed and examined Hannibal's route. He has already said in 36 that in describing a country unknown to his readers he will not give the names of places, rivers, and towns which will convey no meaning to them, but will find other means of making the reality intelligible. Polybius, returning to his story, in which he had left Hannibal starting up the Rhone, describes Scipio's arrival at the empty camp, his surprise at Hannibal's new direction and his return to the sea.

Hannibal, in four days from the crossing of the Rhone, reached the place called the Island, populous and corn growing, in the angle formed by the course of the Rhone with that of a tributary called Skaras, its third side being formed by impracticable mountains. The words show that Polybius did not suppose his readers acquainted with the names Island and Skaras, but that he had been struck by the resemblance between the shape and size of the Island, and that of the part of Egypt called the Delta, and that this analogy would enable them to identify it. The analogy suggests that Polybius is referring to the Rhone and the Durance, which enclose between them an area approximating in size to the Delta, though what he says of the population and fertility of the island can be applied only to a small part of this area.

If Hannibal marched from Fourques up the Rhone he must have crossed the Durance. The other tributaries of the Rhone are of no great importance—the Sorgues, the Ouvèze, the Eygues, and the Drome. The country enclosed by any one of them and the Rhone is too small to be compared with the Delta. I think anyone reading Polybius without preconceptions, and looking for his island on a map of France, would suppose he was giving a general description of the course of the Durance with reference to the Rhone. Polybius does not mention the distance from the camp by the Rhone to the Skaras or the Island.

He says that after four days Hannibal came to the island, but gives no indication of distance. We have to consider the conditions. Hannibal had 38,000 infantry, 8,000 horse, a number of elephants and a great mule-train. The infantry and cavalry alone in the most perfect modern order would form a column sixteen miles long, which with the elephants and mules would be twenty miles long. It would take the infantry alone between five and six hours to march across London Bridge and twice that time to ford a river, where the pace must be much reduced. I infer that the whole army could not have forded the Durance in one day. But the Durance at its nearest point is at least eighteen miles from Fourques, and there is no reason to suppose that the ford was at the nearest point. I see no difficulty in supposing that Hannibal would spend four days in moving his army from Fourques to the north bank of the Durance, and much in supposing that in that time he could have reached a point more than twenty miles north of that river. Once in the Island, Hannibal sided with the elder of two brothers, who were quarrelling as to the kingship, secured him the supremacy, and consequently obtained from him supplies and new arms for his troops and an alliance against the Allobroges, whose resistance he expected to meet further north. Accordingly there was no opposition to his march until he approached the route through the Alps. From the Island he marched eighty-eight miles in ten days, meeting with no opposition from the local chiefs of the Allobroges, who feared his cavalry and the native allies. But the native allies went home as Hannibal was approaching the difficult ground, where the Allobroges assembled an army to resist him and occupied a position which could not be turned. Hannibal, on finding the enemy in the hills, halted and had a reconnaissance made; he then advanced to a second camping-ground, from which he sent forward a body of the troops to seize the enemy's position in the night. Here the first point to be noted is that the ten days' march does not take Hannibal to the battlefield. Two more days follow, during which he advanced with precautions.

Accordingly the 1,400 stadia from the Rhone to the first battlefield, which is at the beginning of the Alps, are not to be divided into 800 for the ten days' march and 600 for the distance from the crossing of the Rhone to the Island. The difference between 1,400 and 800 must be divided between the four days before the Island and the two days before the battle. Up to the battle Hannibal is moving in the Rhone Valley (*αὐλών*). The battle takes place at the point where the army enters the Alps, the mass of mountains between the Rhone Valley and Italy. The two previous days are spent in the approach to the difficult ground.

Recapitulating this narrative of Polybius, I think it means that from a point not far north of the Durance Hannibal marched his infantry along the easiest ground near the bank of the Rhone, that his cavalry guarded its right flank, and that the troops of the native chiefs marched on the right of the cavalry as a flank guard against attacks from the tribes in the hills. This native flank guard was withdrawn when the army was near Valence, and Hannibal entered the narrow country between the Isère and the mountains.

I now propose to examine Livy's account of this part of the journey.

After crossing the Rhone Hannibal assembles the army and makes a speech. Next day he sets out for *Mediterranea Galliae* (*ὡς εἰς τὴν μεσόγαλιαν τῆς Εὐρώπης* as Polybius writes), not thinking it the more direct route to the Alps, but that the further he went away from the sea the less likely he would be to be impeded by Scipio, with whom he had no mind to fight until he reached Italy. His fourth camp was in the Island, formed by the confluence of two Alpine rivers, the Rhone and the Saras, which rise in the Alps at a distance from one another and embrace a good deal of country in the interval between them.

Livy gives the same account as Polybius of the events in the island, but he gives the name of the friendly chief, Brancus, and calls the tribe itself Allobroges, a name which Polybius has given to the hostile tribes against which the friendly chief guarded Hannibal's march.

Then come four or five paragraphs

which have long been regarded as inconsistent with the story of Polybius, and which, at any rate, cannot have been taken from him.

After the delay in the Island Hannibal resumed his journey towards the Alps, for which he chose not the direct route, but one turning from it to the left and taking him to the Tricastini, along the edge of the lands of the Vocontii and towards the Tricorii. He met with no obstacle till he came to the Durance, a formidable river, which he forded with difficulty. Meanwhile Scipio came to Hannibal's deserted camp by the crossing of the Rhone, and, seeing that he could not overtake him, returned to the sea. From the Durance Hannibal reached the Alps through a country generally level, with the good peace of the inhabitants. Then his army first approached the mountains, and saw the snows, and also came upon the enemy's advanced posts, whereupon he halted and made reconnaissance. The first battle follows.

Livy's story coincides with that of Polybius to the Island. The coincidence is renewed on the march leading to the preliminaries of the first battle, a march carried out *cum bona pace incolentium*, which corresponds with the escort of the friendly tribe described by Polybius. The description of the crossing of the Durance leads Livy back to Scipio. I think this shows that Livy thinks of Hannibal going from his camp by the Rhone to the Durance, and crossing that river while Scipio was coming to his camp. The march from the Durance *campestri maxime itinere* must be placed in the Rhone Valley, for there is no other *campestre iter* until the plain of the Po; the country between is all mountains. But what about the Island, the turn to the left, the Tricastini and the Tricorii?

Livy did not invent, he was a compiler. He had before him Polybius and other historians, and composed his narrative by selection from them. I think he found in one of the others an account of the march from the Rhone crossing, up the Rhone Valley, in which the crossing of the Durance was described, but the Island and the Skaras not mentioned. So he tells us that the only

obstacle in this part of the journey was the Durance. But in Polybius he found the Island and the Skaras, and in some other source the name Brancus and the description of his clan as Allobroges. Where was the Skaras? Did it come before or after the Druentia? How far off from the Rhone crossing was the Druentia? Livy thought it best to put in both rivers and to begin with the Skaras and the Island, for which he had the authority of Polybius.

He was much impressed with Hannibal not going by the straight road. The straight road is first mentioned when Hannibal starts from the Rhone crossing. It was the road along the south bank of the Durance, the road followed in after times by the Cimbri and Teutones. Hannibal does not go straight on by this route, but turns away to his left towards the centre of Gaul. Livy has found in his non-Polybian sources some geographical information. Hannibal's route went past the Tricastini, the Vocontii and the Tricorii. The Tricastini were perhaps near the St. Paul Trois Châteaux, the Vocontii may be anywhere in the Vercors; the Tricorii possibly near them in the mountains about Grenoble. The route would hardly touch the Vocontii till the Alpine edge of the Rhone Valley was crossed, nor the Tricorii till further on amid the Alps. Neither of these tribes could have been reached before the march *bona pace incolentium*, that preceded the first battle. Livy has brought in between the Island and the Durance what I may call a proleptic or anticipatory general account of the route to be taken and the tribes which would be found on it. Here he repeats his earlier remark that Hannibal's was not the direct route; that instead he made a turn to the left. This is recapitulatory, and refers to the change of direction made after the passage of the Rhone.

My conclusion is that Livy had three documents or sets of documents before him, that he took from Polybius or a similar source XXXI. 1-8, returned to this source in XXXII., and referred to it for XXXII. 6; that he took XXXI. 9 (the turn to the left and the reference to the three tribes) from a second source, and XXXI. 10-12 from a third source.

In amalgamating these various fragments I think he has confused the order of events and the geography; yet each passage appears to me to be from an authentic and true account.

The question remains: What river was the Skaras or Saras? Probably that can never be determined with certainty. Colonel Colin, to whom I am indebted for most of my ideas on the subject of Hannibal's route, suggests the Sorgues, to which I see no objection in the accounts of Livy and Polybius. But I think the Durance itself might be the Skaras. It better suits the general description of the Island and the comparison with the Delta. If Polybius found that river called Skaras and did not know the name Druentia, and if Livy knew of the Druentia, but not of the Skaras except from Polybius, the confusion (as I think it) of Livy would be explained.

The editors of both writers print *Isapas* and Isara, instead of *Σκαπας* and Saras, and no doubt had in mind the Isère. But even if the MSS. read Isara

it might mean the Durance. In the campaign of Marius against the Cimbri and Teutones, it is now believed¹ that Marius pitched his camp in the Alpilles, a small range of hills east of the Rhone and south of the Durance, stretching from near Tarascon towards Orgon. The barbarians had invaded Spain, and, returning from the Pyrenees, crossed the Rhone at Tarascon and moved by the south bank of the Durance, passing the camp of Marius, who followed them and defeated them near Aix.

Orosius, in his account of these events says that Marius pitched his camp near the confluence of the Isara and the Rhone ('cum iuxta Isarae Rhodanique flumina, ubi in sese confluent, castra posuisset.' V. 16). Here must not Isara mean the Durance?

SPENSER WILKINSON.

All Souls' College, Oxford.

¹ See Gilles, *Campagne de Marius en Gaule* (1870), and Berenger-Féraud, *La Campagne de Marius en Provence* (1895).

THE NEW LYRIC FRAGMENTS.

THE May issue of the *Classical Review* contained an article by Mr. J. M. Edmonds upon the fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus which were recently published in Part X. of the *Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. With the numerous suggestions there made for the restoration of the fragments I am not here concerned, except in so far as they affect the decipherment of the originals or the length of lacunae. Mr. Edmonds makes a number of very positive assertions as to what can or cannot be read, and since they seem to me to be largely fallacious, I take an early opportunity of expressing dissent.

A word or two first on some general principles. Measurement of lacunae and estimation of the space occupied by various combinations of letters are, of course, an elementary part of the business of restoring defective MSS. In our editions of papyri losses are, where possible, represented approximately by dots; but generally the number of letters supplied may slightly exceed

or fall below the number of dots according to the proportion of narrow or wide letters in the supplement proposed. Moreover, with an irregular hand like that of Pap. 1231, a greater variation is possible than in a more careful text, such as Pap. 1233. Whether complete photographs are given or not, the indications supplied in the printed pages, if used with discrimination, should mostly suffice for practical purposes, though letter-tracing may conduce to greater accuracy. But the fact that a certain combination suits the given space is no proof of its correctness; the space limits the possibilities; probabilities depend largely on other considerations. Secondly, in Pap. 1231 fr. 1 Col. ii. Mr. Edmonds detects a serpentine initial line, and infers that the initial line of Col. i. may also be very slightly serpentine but not zigzag. Initial letters of lines in literary papyri do not usually zigzag, nor for that matter are they wont to pursue a serpentine course. Not seldom, how-

ever, scribes had a tendency, as they proceeded with a column, to begin lines slightly to the left of the perpendicular, so that the finished column appears to lean over somewhat to the right. In Col. ii. here the writer has in two places (ll. 6 and 24) begun a line further out by about the space of a letter than the line preceding. Otherwise the initial letters are practically vertical, except that just at the foot there is a slight tendency back towards the right owing to the projection of the last line of the preceding column. But there is no reason to suppose that Col. i. followed a like course; on the contrary the initial line is vertical so far as it can be traced, as is that of fr. 56. All that can be legitimately inferred in this regard from Col. ii. is that in this MS. the lines in the middle of a column sometimes began further to the left by about the space of one letter, those at the bottom by about the space of two letters, than those at the top. But without evidence that in the given case they actually did so, such assumptions are better avoided, if possible.

I turn now to details, which I take in the order in which they appear in Mr. Edmonds's article. In Pap. 1231 fr. 1 i. 27 (l. 15 of the poem: *Classical Review*, p. 73) either *νεμνα* or *μεμνα*, as stated in our note, can be read; to say that the word is glossed as *μέμναι* is misleading, the gloss referring only to the syllable *-μνα*. Mr. Edmonds continues: 'The letter before *μέμνα* is beyond all doubt *ν*. In l. 16 the Papyrus certainly has *παρεοίσας* and not *ἀπεοίσας*.' Both assertions may be rejected. It is doubtful whether any part of the letter before *μεμνα* or *νεμνα* is visible. The dark mark discernible (exaggerated in the facsimile) is not certainly ink, and may be of the same character as similar marks which proceed at intervals in a straight line below this point to the bottom of the column. If, however, it does belong to any letter, that letter was most probably *not ν*. With regard to *παρεοίσας*, this, as stated in our note, is the more suitable reading, but *ἀπεοίσας* is possible. If *παρεοίσας* is right, I should be sorry to deny that

μη can have preceded. At the beginning of l. 15 (=27) *δ* is quite improbable, and Mr. Edmonds's [οὐ]δέ is therefore unsuitable. The same may be said of *τις* in the preceding verse. He further declares (p. 74) that in l. 8 (=20) the papyrus must have had *κρίνεν*, not *κρίννεν*, and in l. 10 *κοῦδέ*, not *κωῦδέ*, which is too long, nor *οὔδέ*, which is too short; that for l. 11 *οὔδέν*, *οὔκετ'*, *τόσσον*, *πλείον* are too short; and that *Κύπρις ἔρασαν* or *ἔρωσαν* is too long in l. 12. *οὔδέν* (*οὔκετ'*) is certainly rather short, otherwise all these assertions are disputable. In l. 20 (=32), I agree that Mr. Rackham's *πесоδομάχεντας* suits the conditions better than *ἱππομάχεντας*; this is the one contribution to the poem which I regard as a substantial improvement. Since the height of the columns is unknown, the number of the stanzas in the poem cannot be determined. In fr. 15. 2. *χρύσανθι* (p. 75) is impossible, since the first letter cannot be *χ*. At the end of l. 3 *ο* is possible after *τ*, but so are several other letters.

In Pap. 1233 fr. 1 ii. 9 (l. 2 of the poem), Mr. Edmonds asserts (p. 76) that the letters *ει* in the papyrus are certain. The letter after *ε*, as stated in our note, may be *γ*, *η*, or *π*. Again in l. 11 (18) he pronounces that the papyrus had [ᾗτ]α, not [κα]τα, which is too short. But the space occupied by *τ* does not differ appreciably from that occupied by *κ*. Mr. Edmonds has perhaps not noticed that the crossbar of *τ* usually comes very close to, if it does not touch, the adjacent letters. In ll. 8-9 (15-16), for instance, where a *κ* stands immediately below a *τ*, the latter takes slightly the smaller space. In fr. 4. 10, [ντε]s definitely ends the line, as is shown by the absence of a bracket in our transcript; the fact that a stop follows has naturally no bearing on the point. I may perhaps be permitted to observe, in conclusion, that the suggestion that the word following *λάμπροι* was some form of *πρότονος* had already been made in our note; and that it is possible to exaggerate our obligations, great as they are, to Wilamowitz.

A. S. HUNT.

NOTES

DEMOSTHENES, LEPTINES,
§ 139.

[σκοπῶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο] καὶ μὴν οὐδ' ἐκείνου γ' ἀποστατέον τοῦ λόγου, ὅτι. . . The first four words are rightly bracketed, or omitted, by almost all the editors. They are *alternative* to the next sentence; the two forms of transition to a new argument are *mutually exclusive*; we must either omit the first clause or the second, and the best course is to omit the first.

In the *Classical Review* for March (vol. xxviii., p. 50) an attempt is made to retain both clauses, by putting the clause beginning with καὶ μὴν into a parenthesis; but καὶ μὴν is always at the beginning of a new sentence, as it is used to mark an emphatic transition to a new argument. It means 'Again, further,' and is most unsuitable in a parenthesis.

Again, it is suggested that, instead of καὶ μὴν οὐδ' ἐκείνου γ' ἀποστατέον τοῦ λόγου, we should read καὶ μὴν οὐδ' ἐκείνῳ γ' ἀποστατέον τοῦ λόγου, 'this is an argument that not even Leptines can afford to neglect.' But ἐκείνῳ cannot possibly refer to Leptines. ἐκείνους must refer to someone who was

absent, as Chabrias in § 78, Leucon in § 36, and other *absent* benefactors in §§ 104, 113, 117; whereas Leptines was doubtless *present*; it was the law of Leptines that was on its trial; of course he was in court. When Demosthenes wishes to use the right pronoun to indicate Leptines, he uses, not ἐκείνους, but οὗτος, as in § 144, τοῦτο δ' οὐδεὶς κίνδυνος, and in § 9, οὗτοσί . . . Λεπτίνης.

καὶ μὴν is very often followed by ἐκείνο, with or without γε, to introduce the new argument. Thus we have καὶ μὴν followed by ἐκείνο in §§ 72, 82; by ἐκείνῳ γε in Speeches 8 § 16; 9 §§ 30, 68; and by οὐδ' ἐκείνῳ γε in Speeches 24 §§ 60, 67, and 40 § 29. Instead of οὐδ' ἐκείνου γε . . . ὅτι, we have, in the present passage, its practical equivalent: οὐδ' ἐκείνου γε . . . τοῦ λόγου . . . ὅτι.

Your correspondent is perfectly right in saying that ἐκείνου, 'referring forward' to a new argument, is inconsistent with the previous use of τοῦτο which refers to the same argument. This is quite true; and it is one of the reasons for rejecting the previous clause: σκοπῶ δὲ καὶ τοῦτο.

J. E. SANDYS.

St. John's House, Grange Road, Cambridge.

REVIEWS

HOMERIC LITERATURE.

- (1) *Homeri Carmina*. Cum prolegomenis, notis criticis, commentariis exegeticis edidit J. VAN LEEUWEN J. F. ILIAS. Pars altera, libri xlii-xxiv. 9 $\frac{3}{8}$ " × 6 $\frac{3}{8}$ ". 1 vol. Pp. 448. Lugduni Batavorum: A. W. Sijthoff, 1913. M. 8.
- (2) *Homer*, von GEORG FINSLER. Erster Teil. Der Dichter und seine Welt. Zweite, durchgesehene und vermehrte Auflage. 1 vol. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " × 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xvi + 460. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 5.
- (3) *Homerische Aufsätze*, von Dr. ADOLF ROEMER. 1 vol. 9 $\frac{5}{8}$ " × 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. vi + 217. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 8.
- (4) *Die Odyssee als Dichtung und ihr Verhältnis zur Ilias*. 1 vol. 8 $\frac{1}{2}$ " × 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. x + 360. Paderborn: Ferdinand Schöningh, 1914. M. 5.40.

(1) In his apparatus criticus Professor van Leeuwen continues to have all the courage of his *Enchiridium*. The exegetic notes are helpful and suggestive as before, and display an enviable

knowledge of the poems. There is much in them that is new; Roemer is evidently right when he says there is still *aus Homer selbst für Homer unendlich viel zu lernen*. Above all, the poetry gets fair play. The editor does not lightly argue interpolation, dislocation or working-over. If a passage or sentence is constructed *neglegentius* or shows *insolita ubertas*, he leaves it at that; other great poets besides Homer have done violence to grammar. Lines are in fact restored to the text—I count thirty-six—but a few passages of some length are still banned. The ‘Leporello Catalogue’ is sacrificed, apparently to τὸ ἀπρεπές and the idea that Hesiod was the first to make lists. Against the Theomachy the ‘Milesian spirit’ has not prevailed, and it is retained in spite of doubts.

The following would appear to be slips: on xviii. 593, K. 353; on xxi. 360 (crit. note), ἀγωνῆς; on xvii. 73 (line 7), *Taphiorum*; and on 561 the last word.

(2) Dr. Finsler’s handbook is republished in a slightly enlarged form and in two parts. The first of these, styled ‘The Poet and his World,’ includes: (1) Preliminary Questions (*Vorfragen*), (2) The Homeric World, (3) Homeric Poetry, and (4) Homeric Criticism. A second instalment is to contain an exposition of the subject-matter of the poems.

The book was intended primarily for teachers in schools in which Homer is not read in the original, but the cultured public were kept in view, and even the *Fachmann* or Homeric expert. It seems to have met with success, but one is tempted to think that the division now carried out had better have been into an elementary volume dealing with the *Realien*, the poetry and the story, and a more advanced one treating the *Vorfragen* and the history—which would bear expansion—of Homeric criticism.

In the sections on the World of Homer and the Poetry the facts and the qualities of style are all set forth in clear and readable summaries. The *Vorfragen* show that the author is a follower of Wilamowitz. Homer is a real personality. This great poet flourished about 700 B.C. in Ionia and wrote the *Iliad*, welding a mass of epic

material into a unity by means of the *Wrath* and adding the divine machinery. The *Odyssey* was put together from pre-existing epics by a *Bearbeiter* about 600 B.C. It is a familiar view, but one that has few adherents. It leaves us to marvel that these two individuals, living and writing in historical Greece, should have vanished completely, ἀῖστοι ἄπυστοι, leaving not even their names, but only one between them which has always been a puzzle. That is so difficult of acceptance that on it alone—not to mention the language and other difficulties—one feels there must be a flaw in the reasoning on which the conclusions are based. Dr. Finsler appears to arrive at them by separating the authorship of the two epics, and by accepting the old view of Homer as *Kollektivname* and a doubtful one about the Cycle. But on these points the saner criticism of later years is practically ignored. The ‘dependence’ of the *Odyssey* must be fully demonstrated afresh, and Hiller has to be reckoned with as regards the *Kollektivname*, and Monro, Lang and Allen for the Cyclics. Brevity and compression were no doubt necessary; but, when one particular solution of the problem is stated for public acceptance, all essentials should be noticed, however briefly. The concluding section on *Homerkritik* is impartial and good so far as it goes. But the linguistic side is hardly touched, and the whole is much too German. Niese’s superannuated treatise cannot now be accepted as the last word on the *Catalogue*. The Pisistratean ‘fable’ is treated as finally disposed of, and Dr. Finsler seems to interpret correctly the Leukas-Ithaka literature when he says that the case against Dörpfeld is not to be resisted.

The ideal Homeric *Wegweiser* has still to be written. When the increasing purpose of Homerology produces that final text-book, we may expect to find that it does not try to combine in one effort instruction for all grades of those interested in Homer, from *virgines puerique* to full-grown Homerists; that it carefully distinguishes ascertained fact or high probability from what is little more than mere assumption; and that its author sinks his own

personality almost as completely as Homer does his.

(3) The essays in Professor Roemer's volume are three: 'an earnest and seasonable word,' as he styles it, on the Homeric art as exhibited in the ninth *Iliad*; a defence of the second half of the *Odyssey*, republished from his *Homerische Studien* (1902); and a discussion of the epic *Göttermaschine*. It is the last work from Roemer's pen, and one may anticipate that the loss to Homeric criticism which his death has caused will not be deplored by his own side alone. The tradition is being carried on by Belzner, Dachs and other devoted 'Ρομηρίδαι.

The style is not a pleasant one and there is undue indulgence in strong expressions, superlatives and points of exclamation; but there is also, as we expect, a surpassing familiarity with the Scholia and a discriminating application of the *Exegese und Aesthetik* contained in them to establish the unity of the epics. Roemer's works form a considerable series extending back to his *De Scholiis Victorianis* (1874) and his well-known *Ein Dichter und ein Kritiker* (1877). In the latter he trounced Peppmüller for applying the *Pulverationsmethode* to the twenty-fourth *Iliad*, and 'back to the poetry' has been his own leading principle ever since. "Ὀμηρον ἐξ Ὀμήρου σαφηνίζειν he describes as the *Grundlage unserer Wissenschaft*. For the criticism of the nineteenth century the poet, he says, hardly existed.

On the ninth *Iliad*, he scouts the idea that the *Presbeia* was ever an *Einzellied*, and also the most peculiar view of Robert that it is a glorification of Diomedes. He accepts the part of Phoenix as essential and original, therein agreeing with Rothe and Scott in their recent demonstrations, and differing from the disintegrators generally. But his chief point is the character of Achilles, the ἦθος des Jünglings, and the revenge for 'bitter despite' on which the hero's heart was set. *Ein wahrer Vulkan dieser Achilleus*, capable of that 'véry extreme of pride and passion,' which Andrew Lang has described in a memorable chapter. Whereas Wilamowitz thinks it absurd to speak of a 'character' of the Homeric

Achilles, Roemer and Lang find a conception worthy of a great poet, and Roemer further fortifies the case for unity by a number of instances in which the art of the poet is illustrated and the correctness of the old Alexandrine interpretation vindicated.

The same method is employed for the second part of the *Odyssey*, in which all is seen to have steady, unswerving reference to the coming *dénoûment* in the *μνησθηροφονία*, and the opportunity is taken to make perfectly clear what was left somewhat obscure in the original publication, that the author had no lingering doubts as to the unity of the poem. Even the 'Continuation' is given a good word; it has had several good words lately, and Spohn and Liesegang are fallen from their high place. The concluding section seeks to show the appropriateness of a number of the divine interventions and epiphanies.

(4) The general verdict on Dr. Rothe's work on the *Iliad* (1910) was, both in and outside his own country, that it was an excellent book by one possessing rare qualifications for the task. His present defence of the *Odyssey* is even better. It is at once simple, broad and deep, and contains hardly an irrelevant word. One feels, when one has read it, that Wolf was right after all about the *Odyssey* and its *admirabilis summa et compages*.

Two-thirds of the volume, excluding an Appendix on the Geography and Leukas-Ithaka, is occupied with an analysis of the poem on lines which are a decided advance on those of the ordinary *Aesthetischer Kommentar*. The rest is a demonstration that the two poems are by one and the same author, and is in two sections, the first of which deals with the subject of the *Odyssey*, and the other with its form considered under the heads of action, technique and language. A 'conclusion' reads like a last word on the Homeric Question, on which the author has written many essays, but seldom anything more impressive than this.

One of the indexes, which are seven in number, gives a conspectus of the many elements in the *Technik* of the poetry, and here one can see *in parvo*

the essence of the book. The constant recurrence of the same poetical expedients and devices is enough in itself, in Rothe's view, to prove the 'conscious working' of one great mind. But there is far more than that. One should read the book carefully and mark for oneself the more objective evidence of unity from references back to the past action and the foreshadowing of events to come; from similarities, parallels and undesigned coincidences; from the constant connection with the *Troica*; from the perfect consistence in the character of Odysseus; and from the contrast, running through the poem 'like a red thread,' between the final triumph of its hero and the miserable fate of Agamemnon, and then contemplate this evidence of design in the mass. And its effect will be found to be greatly strengthened by numerous illustrative instances, catalogued in one of the indexes, from poems of various periods and countries, known to be the products of single brains, in which the 'difficulties' raised by Homeric critics are seen to exist, but passed as trivial by the ordinary reader and the professional critic alike. Such difficulties in the *Odyssey* are fairly met as they are discovered by the analysis, and many are given but short shrift. Rothe does not waste time over objections which are based on modern feeling, opinions which are essentially subjective in nature and of no evidential value, or discrepancies and the like for which the assumption of an *Interpolator* or a *Flick-Poet* or even of *Quellen* only transfers the difficulty instead of removing it. The defence in short is thoroughgoing, and Rothe asks with some confidence whether the evidence which he thus exhibits is consistent with the view of an *epos* put together from a number of poems, young and old, by a mere *Bearbeiter*, 'slenderly gifted' by nature and a poor mechanic, or whether it does not point unmistakably to original work, the outcome of one master mind.

The case for the single authorship of the two poems has never, I think, been presented with such completeness. One part of it is directed to establishing the existence of a poetical *Eigenart* and of a *fassbare Persönlichkeit* which are identical

in the two poems, and the method is as good and the proof as exhaustive as in the first part of the book. The Chori-zontic evidence from language is considered with some fullness and the consistent failure of all the special tests is properly insisted on. It was here that Cauer believed he had found a weak point in Rothe's *Ilias*, but that was *σφηκιᾶν κινεῖν*. Rothe shows that Professor Scott has demolished a proof from the *Patronymica* which Cauer easily accepted, and he might have added the precisely similar case of the *Abstracta*. These are serious blemishes in the *Grundfragen*, but, indeed, the Homerist who does not at times swallow without deliberate mastication is *rarus in terris*.

On the Geography much is made of the point that an epic poet has the right, or may reasonably be allowed, to take liberties with localities for his immediate purposes, and it is undoubtedly a good point. Goethe is sometimes quoted: *man will Wahrheit, man will Wirklichkeit, und verdirbt dadurch die Poesie*, and one might add Tennyson's 'they localise me!' But Rothe seems hardly to give sufficient weight to the change in opinion that has been caused by archaeological enquiry and exploration on the spot. The Archduke Ludwich Salvator's careful and fruitful quest in the Ionian islands gets full justice, but Bérard's volumes are discussed only to show that others have made different identifications, and Leaf's great work on Troy is just mentioned. Recent papers on the *Catalogue* and Miss Stawell's new defence of the Homeric Scamander all tend to help the belief that the geography and topography of the poems, allowing, of course, a modicum of poetical licence, are ancient, good and reliable. On Leukas-Ithaka, Rothe, who has written much about it and was extremely cautious in making up his mind, agrees with other authorities that the Dörpfeldian theory cannot stand. Its originator's promised and long-looked for volume may keep it alive, but it must provide more nourishment, and it is difficult to see where that can come from. Excavation has been disappointing. A Mycenaean house at

Nidri need not be Odysseus' palace because it had a water supply and a 'Blackwater' in the vicinity. Neither will the opposition be persuaded though the skeleton of a faithful hound be unearthed.

I have noticed a few errata. On p. 111 n, read 1902 for 1912; on p. 120, Phea for Thea; on p. 198 n¹, lives for live; on p. 266, n¹, C.P. for *Am. Journ. of Phil.*; on p. 274 n¹, *Quart.* for *Quat.*; and on p. 335 n¹, Thomopoulos for Thermopoulos.

The contents of these four books are generally worlds away from the ideas of the Homeric criticism which was dominant in Germany only a few years ago, and which obstinately refused to admit an alternative view. One of the last points that Rothe notices is the old argument 'that so many great critics could not have been wrong,' and he makes it the text of an interesting dissertation, to which might be added an illustration from the world of science.

Workers in that high sphere once saw, we are told, and for long had great joy of certain rays, the N rays, which are now known not to have existed. The savants saw them because they wished to see them. Some think the influence of the fixed idea was as strong in regard to Homer, and that it was this prepossession that led to those excesses of which Bethe, reviewing Rothe's *Ilias*, said the world was sick; and Bethe expressed the fear that the reaction might be marked by a similar intemperance. There is no sign of that in Rothe's *Odyssee*. He has fought a good fight through a generation not only with great courage but also with a 'sweet reasonableness' that has seldom been disturbed, and he has lived to see his belief surmount all ridicule and rise, for the moment at least, to a place of respect, if not something more, beside the one which he contested.

A. SHEWAN.

PREISENDANZ'S *CARMINA ANACREONTEA*.

Carmina Anacreontea e Bybl. Nat. Par. Cod. Gr. Suppl. 384 post Val. Rosium tertium edidit CAROLUS PREISENDANZ, Bibl. Scr. Gr. et Rom. Teubneriana, Lipsiae, 1912. Pp. xx+66.

THIS little volume supersedes Rose's editions of 1868, 1875, and 1890.

The only MS. of the *Anacreontea* forms part of the famous codex of the Palatine Anthology. This codex the editor has dealt with fully elsewhere.¹ His Preface now repeats his observations and conclusions so far as they concern his present book, and the reader is thus furnished with an account of the history of the MS. and a discussion of the value of the corrections it contains. The volume includes a facsimile of a page of the MS. and an *index verborum*.

In the text and critical notes the editor's first object has evidently been to give a complete account of the readings of the MS. This he appears to have done with admirable precision. Where his text differs from that of the MS., the changes are generally obvious and inevitable, the corrections of his predecessors. In more doubtful passages his preference among the various suggestions lies on the side of the smallest letter-change rather than on that of the literary requirements of the passage. This is a pity. Poor as some of these pieces are, they are nevertheless literature. The same idiosyncrasy makes him omit even to record a large number of excellent suggestions; e.g., Barnes' βρύοντας for βρέμοντας 43. 5, and γέγηθα for τέρπομαι 50. 24; Bergk's γελῶν for λέγων 1. 3, ζαφελῶς for ἀφελῶς 46. 7, and πολλὸν δὲ γῆρας ἐκδύς (cf. Dosiad. *Ar.* 14 ἐκδυγῆρας Salm.) 53. 7; Jacobs' ἔλυσεν for ἔλυσεν 13. 17; Rose's ἐνώροις (= ὠραίοις) for ἐν ὠραις 55. 6; Salmasius' ὠραις for αὔραις 50. 11; Scaliger's ἐκποῆσαι for ἐκβοῆσαι 25. 19; Steph-

¹ Progr. Gymn. Heidelberg. 1910, *Zur griechischen Anthologie*, Teubner; and *Codices Graeci et Latini photographice depicti duce Scalone de Vries tom. XV Anthologia Palatina, praefatus est Carolus Preisendanz*, Sijthoff, 1911.

anus' *ρόδα δός* for *παράδος* (correction of haplographic *ρόδος*) 53. 6, and *πολιοῖς πτεροῖσι* of the singing swan (MS. *ποικίλον πτ. contr. metr.*; cf. *Ep. Bion.* 16 Wilam.) 60. 9.

On the contrary there are several places where he has adopted very questionable readings. In 33. 11 *μὴ φόβησαι* for the MS. *μὴ φοβῆσαι* is hardly Greek. There is no question of the poet's *fearing* Cupid (cf. l. 14). Read *μὴ σοβήσης* or *μὴ σόβει με*, 'don't drive me away.' In 58. 6 where Preisendanz reads *μισοῦν*, the MS. *μισῶν* is right: 'for who hunts after that which he dislikes?' In 24. 8 *οὐκ ἔτ'* for *οὐκέτ'* is a strange correction. He should at least record Davies' *οὐκ ἐπεῖχεν*; 'did she pay no attention to the women?' (For *τί οὖν*; in the next line, read *τί οὔ*; = 'Yes').

In 21. 1 he keeps *ἡ γῆ μέλαινα πίνει* | *πίνει δένδρεα δ' αὐτήν*. The position of the adjective is surely impossible, and the sense of the whole piece calls aloud for an object to the first *πίνει*. Read *πηγὴν μὲν αἶα πίνει* | *πίνει δὲ δένδρε' αἶαν*. The word *δέ* was lost by haplography, and the last two words were read *δένδρεα ἰαν*, which involved a *vox nihili* and tempted emendation, after *αἶα* had disappeared from the first line.

Of the four conjectures of his own

which the editor has ventured to incorporate, one (15. 6) appears to me needless. Adopting Trapp's *τίς ἔσσι*; he reads *σοὶ μέλει τι*; for *σοὶ μέλει δέ*. The only change required is *τί* for *τίς*. Read *τί ἔστι σοὶ μέλει δέ*; 'what is the matter and what your trouble?' comparing for the hiatus 24. 9, Ar. *Thesm.* 193, and *τί οὖν* in Tragedy. Another (53. 1) involves an unlikely—and in this book unparalleled—final elision. A third (14. 18), *τί φῆς αἰὲλ ληρώδης* (for *κηρωθείς*) seems to me to show lack of imagination. Bergk's *τί φῆς*; *ἐκηριώθης*; 'What? does your head swim? [there's more to come],' is admirable, and should have been recorded (*αἰὲλ* was an interpolation, following corruption, to mend the metre). On the other hand, the editor's placing of l. 16 in 55—a line doubtless rejected because corrupt, then added in the margin from another MS., and finally re-incorporated in the wrong place—must commend itself to future editors.

It will be seen that the book has its defects. But, take it all in all, it is a good piece of work, and deserves to rank high in the often excellent and never negligible Teubner series.

J. M. EDMONDS.

24, *Halifax Road, Cambridge.*

A COMPANION TO CLASSICAL TEXTS.

A Companion to Classical Texts. F. W. HALL. Pp. 363. Clarendon Press. 9s. 6d.

MR. HALL has here traced in a clear, skilful, and interesting manner the ways in which books took their origin and final form in Greece and at Rome; the ways in which they were preserved; the changes of form through which they passed; the dangers that beset them, so that while some survived many were lost; how some were much more exposed to chances of alteration, corruption, mutilation than others; how the Greek scribes and the Western monks, the mediaeval scholars, the Greek scholars of the Byzantine renaissance, the Italian scholars of the early and

later Italian renaissance did with them their best or their worst. Greek literature is kept carefully distinct from Latin, Attic from prae-Attic, prae-Alexandrian vulgates (Homer) from Alexandrian texts, prose from poetry, early Latin from Latin of the first century B.C. and later, scientific scholars like Probus and Donatus from amateurs and dilettantes such as Mavortius.

He shows how the methods of 'recension' (*i.e.* the whole study and treatment of a text short of emendation) have been gradually developed, and how even in the most recent years they have been improved and informed (like other branches of knowledge) with a more historical spirit, greater attention being now given to the special history,

so far as it can be traced, of the works of each particular author. When every other means has been exhausted, but not till then, the scholar's final resource is emendation. Mr. Hall enumerates and copiously illustrates the various kinds of error to which Greek and Latin writing from early to late times was liable, not without some good parallels from English books. Two more chapters are added, the last of which deals with the 'nomenclature' of MSS., *i.e.* the Latin names, chiefly geographical, by which they are known, sometimes (for instance *Palatinus*) with a little history, and a few of the men whose names are associated with them by ownership or otherwise. The preceding chapter, which must have cost Mr. Hall no small amount of trouble, contains a short account of the MSS. of a very large number of Greek and Latin authors, stating also the *editio princeps* in each case, and what index or indexes are available. On this last point the treatment is hardly uniform. As to Juvenal for instance only Friedlaender's index is mentioned.

Mr. Hall has thus brought very well together a great amount of information as to facts, principles, and methods, and his book will certainly be the recognised English handbook of the subject. Between the two extremes of superstitious reverence for MSS. and too ready belief

in emendation he maintains a fair mean. He fully allows that after the MS. scholars have said their last word the work of the interpreter and the corrector must follow, the former indispensable as they are only putting as it were so much material into the hands of the latter; and that along with conscientious labour at interpretation correction is often an absolute need. The last truth is one that requires to be emphasised. Too many rather inert minds, reading with interest his long account of the causes of error in MSS. and admiring the skill with which scholars mostly dead have corrected the various mistakes which he cites, will take it all only as an analysis of past work, not as an instrument for future work of their own or others. They will think, as Jowett (not that his mind was inert) always thought, that now at any rate the classical texts have been put right and nothing much remains to be done, nothing at least that we are capable of doing. What such an analysis as Mr. Hall's should really suggest to them is rather that where many mistakes have been detected many remain, and that by close attention, clear thinking, grammatical as well as other knowledge, a little insight, and much perseverance these may often be detected too.

HERBERT RICHARDS.

THE TEUBNER TEXT OF PLINY.

C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum Libri Novem Epistularum Ad Traianum Liber Panegyricus. Recensuit R. C. KUKULA. I vol. 8vo. pp. xvi+426. Leipzig: Teubner. 1912. M. 3.20. Bound, M. 3.80.

THIS second edition of Herr Kukula's text of the younger Pliny's works is at once a record of useful work done and an earnest of work which is still to do. Since Keil's edition of 1870 placed the textual criticism of the author on a scientific basis, considerable advances have been made in investigation of the different MSS.; and these advances must qualify the opinions propounded

in Keil's preface, and followed in his text of the letters, regarding the relative value of the *Mediceus* (*M*) and other sources. We are, however, as yet without any equally authoritative edition fully explaining editorial principles of textual judgment, and based on the comparison of complete collations. It is already about twelve years since Merrill wrote in the preface to his selection that he hoped to publish 'at no distant date' a critical edition of the whole correspondence; and now this promise, it is interesting to observe, has been renewed in Kukula's announcement of a larger edition which he has in preparation with Merrill, and which

will admit ampler textual discussion than is feasible 'per legitimas *Bibliothecae Teubnerianae* angustias.' This alliance should be a valuable one; for, if Merrill was, in contrast with Keil, probably less than just to the claims of the *MV* tradition, Kukula on the other hand does not maintain so unreservedly as Merrill the superiority of the *RF* tradition to that of *MV*, but is willing to see a better choice of words in the former and a better order of words in the latter ('rectiorem quam ceteri codices praestant uerborum ordinem'). It is, of course, to be noted that *R* (*Riccardianus*) is Merrill's *B* (*Beluacensis*), and that Kukula, like Hardy, applies *B* to the Bodleian volume.

Plinian textual criticism is intricate enough to explain the tardy issue of an edition claiming to be definitive; for not only are there three main problems, perfectly distinct, as regards the nine books, the correspondence between Pliny and Trajan, and the *Panegyricus*, but in respect of the nine books there are again perfectly distinct subordinate problems, complicated, as Otto showed in *Hermes* XXI. (1886), by imperfections in the best codices and by the capricious alterations of the writer of the Medicean. Students of Pliny will, therefore, look forward with interest to the completion of Merrill and Kukula's researches as collaborators.

While exhaustive criticism must be more appropriate to the promised larger work, some account may be given of the present edition. The *praefatio* contains a clear summary of the 'subsidia recensionis' and acknowledges services rendered by Plinian scholars. There is naturally not commendation for all; thus, in connexion with the *Panegyricus*, W. Baehrens is described as 'Aemili filius qui nuper Panegyricos Latinos gloriosius sane quam facetius retrac-tauit,' and is denounced as desiring 'nefanda in textum Plinianum restituere.' One portion of the *praefatio* is devoted to a serviceable examination by F. Spatzek of the *clausulae* in Pliny. The statistics are of moment at a time when the study of prose rhythms has been extended to later periods of Latin and to English authors; and they serve to prove that Pliny's confessed admira-

tion for Cicero had, among its other effects, an influence upon the endings of his sentences.

Compared with the first edition, the text is altered in two main ways—the one, in respect of the order of words, at points where Kukula in his earlier text less rigidly followed *MV* for the correspondence and *A* (= *Upsaliensis*) for the *Panegyricus*; and, the other, in respect of fresh conjectures. On the whole, it may be doubted whether very much has been achieved by Herr Kukula's second thoughts. Of most of the changes, the best that can be said is that they are possible; of many, it must be said that they are questionable and even unlikely. Few are so good as his *balbi* (*Paneg.* 48, 1) for the unsatisfactory *alii* of the codices. This is distinctly attractive, leads up well to *et attoniti*, and is a vast improvement on Madvig's *albi*. In *Paneg.* 50, 5, *prodiit* is at least a more forcible and plausible guess than Kukula's own previous reading, *quas* <rap>uit.

Let us examine a few changes which may be called possible. In X. xxiii. 1, there is certainly an open field for conjecture in the very doubtful second sentence, where a lacuna has been not unreasonably suspected. Kukula's latest proposal, 'itaque tamen aestimanti nouum fieri oportere uideris mihi . . .,' throws overboard his previous *uideor* and makes the Bodleian *uideris* possible by introducing *oportere*, but it leaves the exact force of the collocation *itaque tamen* hard to understand. In X. xxxiv. 1, *prae-graues* is not unnatural and not un-Plinian; but the run of the sentence makes some word like *aeque* more likely after *hetaeriae*, as in Lightfoot's conjecture *hetaeriae aeque breui fient*. In X. li. 2, 'quamuis maxime possim,' retained by Hardy from Avantius with the remark that it is 'probably incorrect,' must be regarded as unconvincing; for Pliny's language to the emperor could scarcely be to the effect, 'I dare not repay you, sire, however great my power may be.' In the circumstances, then, Kukula's *poscam* is as sensible as anything suggested, and involves less change than Mommsen's proposal 'ne gaudio quidem quamuis maximo possum.' In *Paneg.* 34, 2,

Kukula now reads 'auxerat hoc malum *partium* auaritia,' meaning 'greed for a share in the confiscated goods had increased this evil' (i.e. *delatio*), where he had *participum* before, to replace *partim* or *partum* or *parcum* of the codices, commonly altered to *principum*. At *Paneg.* 94, 2, the hesitation between *dissimillimo* and *dis simillimo* is natural; if the former is the original word, Pliny almost inevitably had also in mind *dis simillimo* in light of *dis simillimum*, *Paneg.* 7, 5, which Kukula quotes.

Other suggestions are less likely. In III. v. 10, *nempe*, for the *saepe* of all the codices and editions, was probably, if I might hazard a guess, prompted in the editor's mind by 'intellexeras *nempe*' two sections later; but neither this occurrence (where, by the way, the connexion of thought is not quite parallel) nor the occurrences cited from III. xviii. 6 and *Paneg.* 78, 3, do much to justify a purely arbitrary change. In VIII. xxiv. 1, where the Aldine edition gives 'admoveam tamen ut quae scis teneas et obserues, aut scias melius,' Kukula proposes *respicias melius*, which is a loss in antithetic vigour. Editors here may be content to choose between *aut scias melius* and the Medicean *aut nescire melius*. In X. xxx. 2 *quoquo* is not needed for *quo*. The preference expressed for *facias* in X. lxxvi., without however an actual departure from *faciat*, would involve a sacrifice of idiomatic force. In X. lxxviii. 2, 'plures enim, et quanto infirmiores erunt, idem petent' (B and Hardy) reads quite in Trajan's manner, and is not improved by Kukula's change to *eo quanto*. Letter X. lxxxvii. concludes in Hardy's text with 'filii honore continebis,' a restoration from the margin of the Bodleian copy, and, no doubt, a strange expression, yet preferable both to the emendations hitherto submitted and to Kukula's own alteration 'honore <rogo> contineas.' In X. lxxxviii., Keil's omission of the unintelligible *quam* after *gloriam* is safer than Kukula's <per>*quam*. Letter X. cxlii. ends in manifest corruption; and as no convincing remedy is forthcoming, it is better to obelise the text like Keil; for Kukula's attempted restitution 'id existimo acturum ut praestantior ceteris praeferatur' has no

more to recommend it than the many other guesses recorded. The insertion of *temporum* in X. cxviii. 1 seems to me clumsy.

In the *Panegyricus* many of the changes are equally unnecessary. The insertion of *evocata* at 69, 6, is a syntactical improvement, but is not more inevitable than a dozen participles that might be proposed. *Vicies* in 70, 6, is textually preferable to Kukula's previous *ipse*, but I doubt if it is more natural. At 77, 7, there is not the slightest need to alter the tradition 'quippe etiam fortuna uideatur indignum, si possit honores dare, qui gerere non possit,' and to substitute *indignus*. In 80, 5, I find no clear justification for altering 'omne genus hominum' to 'omne genus humanum'; and in 85, 7, the change of 'umquam . . . humile' to 'quidquam . . . humilius' would require more than the gain in strict logic to impugn the combined testimony of the MSS. which the editor himself considers a *mirus consensus*.

It is impossible to resist the conclusion that Kukula is often arbitrary in his conjectures and alterations; nor is he always consistent in his preferences. Let us contrast him in two passages with Keil. In V. viii. 11 Keil takes 'ne a meis uerbis recedam' from *M* alone against 'ne a forensibus uerbis recedam' of *Dpra*, and in VI. iv. 4 'uereor omnia, imaginor omnia' for a similar reason, namely, his preference for *M*. But Kukula deserts *M* by reading *forensibus*, and deserts *Dpra*, which omit *imaginor omnia*.

Of course, it is at times a signal advantage that the editor is not tied to the *RF* tradition as much as Merrill was. So in I. ix. 5, where Merrill's predilection committed Pliny to an absolutely unverifiable statement, 'nemo me apud quemquam sinistris sermonibus carpit' (as was pointed out in Prof. Summers's notice, *Classical Review*, 1904, p. 173), Kukula has wisely forsaken *RF a* and Merrill in favour of the sensible order 'nemo apud me quemquam sinistris sermonibus carpit.' On the other hand, he seems to me right in following Merrill on two points to which Prof. Summers in the same notice took exception—the retention of 'atque ideo'

in I. xviii. 4, where the fifteenth century MSS. have 'atque adeo'; and the reading at II. xiii. 8, 'equidem iuuenis statim iuueni . . . audissime contuli,' where I consider the insertion of *me* after *audissime* not merely needless, but even inconsistent with the general sense of the passage.

I have noted some inaccuracies. In II. xx. 5 *perierierasset* is given as the reading of *M* and *V*. I have not seen the original *V*, but in Chatelain's facsimile of the page concerned the reading is plainly *perierasset*. In X. xxxix. 1 Hardy plausibly adopts the conjecture 'neque enim ratio operis excussa est,' where the Aldine edition reads unintelligibly *plus*. Kukula reads *prius* and claims the suggestion, though Hardy records it as an alternative to *prorsus* put forward by Orelli. Kukula then in his footnote backs *prius* by seven references to the *Panegyricus*, which I took the pains to examine, and which appear to be mainly useless except to prove what we should have been prepared independently to believe—that Pliny was capable of using the word *prius*. In their jumble of different meanings ('formerly,' 'in the first place,' 'preferably') they certainly do not all of them illustrate the use of the adverb to mean 'as yet,' 'up to the present,' which is the sense demanded. The two nearest to being apposite seem to be *Paneg.* 66, 5 and 77, 1.

The *apparatus criticus* is as a whole a

very serviceable one. On Book X., for instance, it is frequently an improvement in fulness upon Hardy's, as when at X. xxxix. 5 we have the record 'conferent *B*, *Cat. Merr.*, conferunt uolgo cum *a*,' where Hardy reads *conferunt* without comment. Occasionally, therefore, we regret omissions; e.g., regarding *adfinem eius*, X. li. 1, Kukula gives no record of the erroneous readings which too long survived Beroaldus' perception of the right text and lured editors into blunders like *ad finem consularatus* in defiance of constitutional history. At X. lxxv. 2 the note is restricted to recording *appellentur* from the Aldine and Beroaldus; but it is of significance, as bearing on the value of Avantius' readings, to give, as Hardy does, his mistakes 'agonas quae' for 'agonas qui' and 'appellantur' for the correct sequence 'appellarentur.' In X. lxxxi. 8 Orelli's change of 'ut necesse sit' to 'ut necesse est' should be entered; and again in X. cxvi. 2 the editor would have done well to mention the *iussi* of Avantius and the Aldine edition. It is not altogether impossible.

A few *corrigenda* are collected at the close of the preface; but some misprints have escaped notice: e.g., *sdiscipulo*, p. iv. l. 1 and *tante* for *tanti*, p. 216, l. 8.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College, University of Durham.

CATULLUS AND OTHERS.

The Poems of Gaius Valerius Catullus. With introduction, notes and translation by CHARLES STUTTAFORD. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo. Pp. xxxii+286. London: George Bell and Sons, 1912. 6s. net.

Catullus, Tibullus and the Pervigilium Veneris. Text and translation by F. W. CORNISH, M.A., J. P. POSTGATE, Litt.D., and J. W. MACKAIL, Hon. LL.D. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo. Pp. xi+376. London: *The Loeb Classical Library*, William Heinemann, 1913. 5s. net.

Translations from Catullus. With an introduction by B. KENNARD DAVIS, M.A. 1 vol. Cr. 8vo. Pp. 125. London: George Bell and Sons, 1913. 3s. net.

ZEUS had eagles and Rheims a jackdaw but Lesbia's sparrow is a more renowned bird than they. The 'loves and cupids' wept at its death-bed and the eyes of countless generations since have followed its absurd little figure down the great 'shadowy road.' For when Catullus bade us think of it like that, he reckoned that he would find a

child and a sentimentalist in every man, and he was right. We all love Catullus and we love him most and first because he is sentimental like ourselves. He sings of stars and babies and speaks of his love as fallen—

velut prati
ultimi flos praetereunte postquam
tactus aratro est ;

he says 'solaciolum' for 'solacium' and 'frigidulus' for 'frigidus,' and he makes his very yacht as sentimental as himself, telling tales, like an old salt, of the past. But we love him for other things too—for his passion and his wit, and above all for his scholarship, his pure literary skill. His *procédés de style* are still near enough to loud-voiced, obvious Ennius and far enough from Vergil's perfection of art concealed, to be seen and recorded as well as felt. They are never crude and yet the impression they give is strong, definite and acutely pleasurable.

Hic, qualis flatu placidum mare matutino
Horrificans Zephyrus proclivas incitat undas
Aurora exoriente vagi sub limina solis,
Quae tarde primum clementi flamine pulsae
Procedunt, leviter resonant plangore cachinni,
Post vento crescente magis magis increbrescunt
Purpureaque procul nantes a luce refulgent,
Sic ibi. . . .

What a description is this! and yet the metrical devices and those epithets that each make a picture can be as easily distinguished as in the broader effects that pleased our youth—

Lit us longe resonante Eoa
tunditur unda.

Of course the power of Catullus is only slightly dependent on such things as these. All true lyrics defy analysis, but there is something specially elusive in the charm of Catullus. La Harpe says of it: 'Celui qui pourra expliquer le charme des regards, du sourire, de la démarche d'une femme aimable, celui-là pourra expliquer le charme des vers de Catulle.' This is very true as well as very French, and it really puts Catullus out of the reach of reproducers. However, the simpler qualities of his matter and manner, his sentimentality and his more obvious effects of style, even a prose translation may hope to render. Two prose versions have recently appeared, one an old friend and the other a new, and both have caught more than

could well have been hoped of the original. Mr. Cornish needs no new praises; his version has long been known for its grace and scholarly faithfulness. Mr. Stuttaford, familiar as a commentator, is a stranger as a translator, but his acquaintance is worth making. His version fits less closely over the Latin than Mr. Cornish's, and so avoids a danger of baldness, though there is loss, too, of course. Mr. Stuttaford renders 'proclivas incitat undas' as 'makes the waves curve and curl' while Mr. Cornish says frankly 'urges on the sloping waves.' A standard French translation gives 'rider la surface unie des flots,' but French translations are always 'safe.' Mr. Cornish's 'step on,' too, is probably nearer to 'procedunt' than 'sweep along' or 'se déroulent.' There is some attractive work in Mr. Stuttaford's volume, and his introduction on the history of the last century B.C. is interesting. There are brief notes, chiefly critical, at the end.

A prose translation of a lyric can really only be a stepping-stone to the original; its function is perhaps rather to point out its beauties than to reproduce them. But with a verse translation the case is different; verse is in the nature of things self-conscious and asks for admiration on its own account. So the trouble is that a verse translation must be judged in a sense by the same standard as the original, and the competition is usually too severe. Mr. Davis of Marlborough comes out of the ordeal better than many. His little book, prefaced by an essay that is quite delightful, contains a good deal of graceful verse and some pieces that have the true song-quality of lyric. The English Hendecasyllables that face the '*Vivamus*—' poem are very pretty and skilful, and the lyrical Hexameters of '*Vesper adest*—' are cunningly represented by these long rhyming lines:

Like the flower that blooms apart in some
garden hidden,
Trodden ne'er by foot of kine, ne'er by ploughs
o'erridden;
Winds shall tend it, showers shall feed, suns
shall shine above it,
Every boy and every girl seeing it shall love it.
Soon, alas! when cruel hands from its stem
have torn it,
Every boy and every girl seeing it shall scorn it.

Even so the maiden dwells dear to all about her;
 Once her maiden charm is lost, boys and girls
 shall flout her.
 Gathered by a husband's hand, soon her charms
 shall wither,
 (Hymen, Hymenaeus, hear; hither Hymen,
 hither!)

It is a most attractive little volume which will charm all who know Catullus or would like to know him.

Tibullus (who has the misfortune to rhyme with Catullus and usually to be bound up with him) has suffered in public esteem from this proximity to a greater name, but Dr. Postgate's new translation in the *Loeb* Catullus volume will bring him to his own 'if there be justice among men.' A French critic once uttered the warning that no mere professor could translate Tibullus; an education in 'le vin de Tokay et les caprices d'une jolie femme' was the qualification in his view. But the Professor of Latin at Liverpool has refuted M. de Pézay. Most prose translations of verse authors are intolerable if read alone, but Dr. Postgate's Tibullus can be read right through without a glance at the Latin opposite and enjoyed like a new and beautiful thing existing for itself; and all who know Dr. Postgate will be sure that the very finest shades of the original are reflected in his version. Here is a couplet taken at random, familiar but not easy to translate well:

Nam fuerit quicumque loquax, is sanguine
 natam,
 Is Venerem e rapido sentiet esse mari.

'For if any man turn prater, he shall find that Venus is the child of blood and whirling seas'—

and another that will show how Dr.

Postgate can deal with the small change of Roman euphuism:

Quaque patent ortus et qua fluitantibus undis
 Solis anhelantes abluat amnis equos.

'—where the gates of dawn are opened and where in tossing waters the Ocean river bathes the Sun-god's panting team.'

Quotation by couplets is no true test, but nearly all Dr. Postgate's version is as good as this. Throughout whole elegies the mind is kept entranced by the translator's word-craft and his fine sense for the poet's thought. This Englishing of Tibullus must be the best thing of its kind produced for many years.

At the end of this same rich volume is printed Dr. Mackail's text and translation of the *Pervigilium Veneris*. The text is all translatable and therefore much emended, but the resulting poem is very lovely. So much, however, does its charm depend upon its singing, dancing rhythms that in prose however good it seems hardly recognizable as itself. But Dr. Mackail, of course, contrives to lend a great deal of grace to his unrhymed English—the very title is attractive, '*The Eve of St. Venus*'—and there could be no more delightful approach to the original. That original has a very appealing loveliness in itself as well as an interest lent by all the centuries since its (much disputed) date. For if it belongs to the winter of the Classical world, it is full of the scent of the coming spring.

Here it completes a volume that contains already very much treasure in a little room.

J. F. ROXBURGH.

Lancing College, Sussex.

TWO BOOKS ON COMMODIAN.

1. *Les Instructions de Commodien Traduction et Commentaire.* Paris: E. Leroux. 5 fr.

2. *Commodien: Recherches sur la Doctrine, la langue et le vocabulaire du poète.* Paris: E. Leroux. 6 fr.

THESE are two companion volumes by Joachim Durel, D. ès L., Professeur au Lycée de Tunis, constituting jointly a thesis for his doctorate (it may be supposed) and a not uninteresting contribution to the evergrowing literature on Commodian. The discovery of the

Instructions fell in a golden age of unpedantic, historical scholarship, and gained them Rigalt for an editor princeps. Modern bibliographies of Commodian shew Britain as the silent sister amidst the activities of French and German and Italian learning. But in the days when Honour Mods. were not, and when less was sacrificed to maintaining the examinable primness of the pupil's (and the elderly virginity of the tutor's) pre-Zielinsky Ciceronian, it was an Oxford savant, Henry Dodwell, who wrote the book of epoch-making authority on the Commodian question.

That question is of historical, not æsthetical, interest: frankly, there has seldom been so great a controversy about a work of so little purely literary merit as the *Instructions* and the *Carmen Apologeticum*. Few will share M. Durel's enthusiasm for the 'intensely African vitality' of the work—least of all, those who doubt whether Commodian was an African at all, and disbelieve that he lived at that early date which chiefly motivated such interest as might be felt in his tirades of stuttering heterodoxy.

Everything depends on the date in this controversy: if the early date is a mistake, then one of many lively chapters in *La Fin du Paganisme*, and one of many brightly trenchant pages in Pichon's *History of Latin Literature* are alike a dead letter.

After Rigalt had first assigned the newly discovered doggrelist to the age of Constantine (on the strength of a misreading *Silvestri* for *Silvestris* in *Instruct.* xxxiii. 5) or, alternatively, to the age of St. Cyprian, Dodwell's dissertation (published in 1698) added such authority to the latter view that it passed unquestioned for more than a century. Pitra (the discoverer of the *Carmen Apologeticum*, in 1852), Ebert, Dombart, de Rossi, Boissier, Manitius, Bardenhewer, amongst other lesser names, all added their suffrages to the opinion that Commodian wrote *cir.* 250 A.D. To this view M. Durel adheres, and by the truth or untruth of this hypothesis stands or falls the main value of his treatise.

I confess that much of what he writes on *Le Christianisme primitif*

(pp. 17-74), appears to be imperfectly documented and loosely stated. But, in any case, if Commodian belongs to a later age, the whole picture of a third century Christianity, still unpleasantly in need of deodorizing from Judaic survivals, as his background, is a misfit.

And the better studied the period, the more does the early attribution waver. Harnack gives a space from 240 till 311, and, on second thoughts, till 378; Monceaux, the space 305-311; Jülicher, anything up to 350; Ramundo, 324 to 378.

A bold theory was put forward by H. Brewer, S.J., under the title *Commodian v. Gaza, ein Arelatensischer Laiendichter aus d. Mitte d. Vten. Jahrhunderts* (Paderborn, 1906), whose proofs, although they leave certain difficulties unsolved (e.g., the *Titani* or *Tutani* and the *Dei Montes*), appear to be so far irreducible, that Commodian does allude to the taking of Rome by Alaric. But whilst his historical and liturgical arguments are strong, Brewer's linguistic arguments for the Gallic origin of the *Instructiones* and *Carmen* are weak; and just here is the chief value of M. Durel's thesis—a lexicon of Commodian's peculiarities. But 'African' Latin (beyond quite narrow limits of idiom) is so shadowy that nothing of adequate solidity can on this side be brought against the historical argument. Brewer carries a great many guns, and a blind eye cannot silence a broadside.

M. Durel devotes a chapter to tabulating 'la place de Commodien dans la tradition Africaine' by parallel citations from Minucius Felix, St. Cyprian, Arnobius, and Lactantius. The table is not uninteresting, but of small critical value when one remembers how soon the *loci tralatitii* of controversy (on both the Christian and the pagan side) were conventionalized. If Brewer chose to arrange his materials in a parallel, adducing (e.g.) Orosius and St. Augustine, and Victor Vitensis, the result would be quite as impressive.

And after all, though Brewer's theory has been described as a bold one, it is he who is defending the really modest thesis that Gennadius knew what he was writing about when he wrote that

Commodian was an amateur theologian and a doggerel poet, who used Lactantius as one of his scanty sources, and whose place falls later than Prudentius. In the defence of Gennadius's accuracy certain difficulties remain; but to the Dodwellian theory, Gennadius's statement abides as a primary objection,

which it needs more than a sneer to reduce. But though I am not convinced by M. Durel's arguments, I am bound to say that, both for the general accuracy of the translation and of the lexicon, the books are to be recommended.

J. S. P.

SHORT NOTICES

Aristarchs Athetesen in der Homer-kritik (wirkliche und angebliche). Eine kritische Untersuchung von DR. ADOLPH ROEMER. Pp. 527. Leipzig, 1912.

IT is strange at first sight to find a long book, full of sound and fury, on such a comparatively remote subject as Aristarchus' atheteses in Homer. Aristarchus' atheteses were academic, they had no effect upon the text; and it has always been imagined that after the labours of Lehrs and Ludwich, there was no doubt what they were. Professor Roemer denies the accuracy of our tradition almost *in toto*. The tradition, it is well known, consists first of the scholia of Ven. 454, next of the scholia of the Townley MS. and other MSS., and thirdly of statements made by authors, such as Strabo, Athenaeus, and Porphyrius, and the mediaeval Eustathius. The Venetian MS. declares in its subscription that its statements about Aristarchus are derived from works by Augustan grammarians, Didymus, and Aristonicus. Hitherto this pair have been given the consideration apparently due to their age. Roemer now dethrones them and sets up against them the second and third categories of sources, especially Porphyrius and Eustathius. Put briefly his position is that statements of Aristarchus' opinions and doctrines in Porphyrius, when they appear to conflict with his atheteses as reported by Didymus and Aristonicus, deserve the preference.

It has always been known that our Alexandrian tradition was defective, owing to its successive compression. The original hypomnemata and syn-

grammata of Aristarchus (to which the *σημεία* referred) were compressed into smaller hypomnemata in the Augustan period; these second hypomnemata were reduced to a running marginal commentary we do not know when or by whom; and this commentary itself meets us in two states—a longer and a shorter—on the margins of Ven. 454. The actual statements are frequently anonymous, and the attribution of them to Aristarchus is in many cases inferential. This inference may have been too freely made, and it is possible that some less definite notation is desirable in editions of Homer. I cannot think however that Roemer's main contention can be upheld, or that there is reason to doubt the substantial accuracy of the ascriptions usually made. His instances cannot be examined in a review; but I must notice the improbability of setting up secondary sources against primary, which is his method.

The original works of Aristarchus were extant at the Christian era. They were reduced to a handy form by Didymus and Aristonicus. It is true we hear of some uncertainty in one or two passages about Aristarchus' reading; there was a difference between these grammarians and Ammonius, Aristarchus' successor. But it is impossible to suppose any grave wholesale ignorance or misapprehension. Even less is it possible to suppose deliberate misrepresentation. Rivalry existed as between grammarians, but bad faith seems out of the question. *A quoi bon?* But whatever objections may be made to the correctness of the Aristarchean tradition in the time of Augustus, these objections apply many times more

heavily to the periods of Athenaeus and Porphyrius. Didymus necessarily had all Porphyrius' material before him. It is not certain that Porphyrius had all Didymus'. No one can say that Aristarchus' works were in existence in A.D. 200. Eustathius, of course, has no *locus standi* at all. But for a glossary or two the excellent man had less than we have.

These considerations seem to me fatal to this thesis. Quasi-clerical errors of ascription, due to successive abstracts, can be admitted; but the method of setting up a later source against an earlier seems to bear its own condemnation. It must be remembered also that Porphyrius himself is only known to us through scholia, and that the Townley scholia, though they contain a good deal that is not in the Venetian, seem to go back to the same sources. What should they go back to?

T. W. ALLEN.

The Public Orations of Demosthenes.
Translated by A. W. PICKARD-CAMBRIDGE. In 2 volumes. 3s. 6d. net each. Oxford: At the Clarendon Press, 1912.

THE speeches here translated are those in the first volume of Butcher's text, less the spurious or dubious pieces and the documents inserted in the *Crown*. Mr. Pickard-Cambridge's version is very good: faithful, clear, responsive, scholarly, and, in short, worthy of his name. His English is not quite the English of modern orators, but that is more their fault than his. He has a pretty turn of expletives. He knows the value of thrift both in syllables and

in words. The introduction is judicious and well put. The notes are brief and helpful. At the end there is a good bold map of Greece, the Aegean, and its coasts, and on one of the fly-leaves a map of Mid-Greece on a larger scale.

Here are a few notes and queries. There is a misprint, or worse, in the Preface, p. 4. In xiv. 38 insert a verb. In xv. 15 omit a comma. In iv. 44 the first 'you' should be 'we.' In v. 4 τοῖς τολμῶσιν is missed, in viii. 26 αὐτόν. In xviii. 295 read 'Sicyonians,' in 302 for 'Tenedos' read 'Abydos.' In xix. 253 for 'the king' read 'the King of Persia.' In xv. 25 should not 'with' be 'against'? There are doubtful renderings at xix. 193, 'the well-known actor' for τουτονί; 199, 'in that magnificent voice of his' for λαμπρᾷ τῇ φωνῇ; 233, 'a somewhat fast life' for ἱταμώτερον. There is a misleading sentence in v. 2. Was it a 'canal' or a trench that Philip was to cut across the Chersonese (vi. 30)? In iv. 38 ζημία seems to mean 'detriment,' 'mischief,' as also perhaps in vi. 37. In xviii. 35 μάλα σεμνῶς ὀνομάζων perhaps scoffs at οἰκειότητος, *adfinitates*; cf. xix. 22, where again the word is put into the mouth of Aeschines. In ii. 12 I should suppose that Demosthenes ascribes to the Athenians readiness of speech, not the glib use of empty talk. In xix. 245 the translator's prose ignores the comic trimeter into which the Greek is here made to fall, in mockery of Aeschines' citation from tragedy. Has it been observed that D. plays a similar trick just above, in 244, where his gibes at A.'s quotation from Hesiod are wound up hexametrically with σὺ διώρισας αὐτός?

E. HARRISON.

CORRESPONDENCE

CICERO AND LUCRETIVS.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIR,—Is it not possible that Cicero intended to use the word 'ars' simply as 'method' or as a 'treatise'? Thus we have 'ars imperatoria, rhetorica, musica'; 'ars amandi,' 'ars poetica,' etc. Thus I have always thought that Cicero intended to commend in Lucretius at once the flashes of his genius, and the consis-

tency with which, in spite of his poetical divergences from his theme, he carried out his plan and object of stating the principles of the Epicurean philosophy. In fact, Cicero eulogises at once the 'anti-Lucrèce chez Lucrèce' and the 'ars' itself.

HERBERT A. STRONG.

Clyst, Farnham Common, Slough.
May 16.

NOTES AND NEWS

A COMMITTEE has been formed to mark the completion of the *Golden Bough* by offering to Dr. Frazer some token in recognition of his great services to learning. It is proposed in connexion with this to form a Frazer Fund for Social Anthropology, from which grants may be made to travelling students and investigators. Those who wish to contribute will kindly write to the Secretary and Treasurer, Mr. F. M. Cornford, Trinity College, Cambridge.

Few Greek scholars, perhaps, are in the habit of reading modern Greek: the more's the pity. Fewer still are said to read the *Quarterly Review*. For those reasons we make no apology for directing attention to the *Quarterly Review* for April, which contains an article by Principal Burrows on 'The New Greece,' stating the modern Greek position truthfully and moderately. In this paper is an impromptu lament, or *μυρολόγι*, composed by peasants, and sung at a little village on Taenarum about Christmas, 1912. Poetry is living still in Greece, and so is courage, where the women sing thus of their sons killed in battle:

Δὲν τὸ θωροῦμε γιὰ κακὸ
καὶ γιὰ μεγάλη προσβολή
νὰ κλαῖμε τὰ παιδία μας;
καὶ πῶς; οἱ Σπαρτιάτισσαις
δὲν κλαῖνε τὰ παιδία τους,
ὅταν πᾶν καὶ σκοτώνουνται

γιὰ τῆς πατρίδας τὸ καλὸ . . .
χαλάλι τοῦ ὁ θάνατος,
γιατὶ λευτέρωσε λαό.

At a recent meeting of the Oxford Philological Society, Mr. J. U. Powell read a paper on 'Fragments of Hexameter Poems in Chicago Papyri.' Professor Goodspeed had with great courtesy sent the papyri to Oxford to be recollated by Professor Hunt, who had discovered the right order and juncture of the fragments, and contributed many new readings and suggestions. They appeared to be from a collection of Hymns, perhaps of the second or first century B.C.: (1) from a Hymn to Cyprus, perhaps with a reference to the deified Arsinoe, wife of Ptolemy Philadelphus: it was probably not from the lost poem of Callimachus on the marriage of Ptolemy and Arsinoe, nor by Posidippus. (2) From a Hymn to Apollo, with a description of Egypt, like Theocr. xvii., and perhaps a reference to the attack of the Gauls on Delphi in 279: the ending ἐπ' ἀγνώστοις ἐπιλοιβαί was a fresh instance of θεοὶ ἀγνώστοι. (3) One on the story of Andromeda, which might have been the original of the Epyllium in Manilius v. 540 sqq. (4) From a Hymn to Isis, in a mixture of hexameters and scazons. There were others, but the whole collection was mutilated. A vote of thanks was passed to Professor Goodspeed.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

* * * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Ballou (S. H.) *The Manuscript Tradition of the Historia Augusta.* 9"×6". Pp. 89. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 4.40.

Bouchier (E. S.) *Spain under the Roman Empire.* 7 $\frac{3}{4}$ "×5". Pp. 200. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net.

Bryant (E. E.) and *Lake* (E. D. C.) *An Elementary Latin Grammar.* 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ "×5". Pp. 115. Oxford: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 1s. 6d. net.

Caesar. *Commentarii de Bello Gallico.* Edited by T. R. Holmes. Riccardi Press books. 10"×6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii+249. London: The Medici Society, 1914. Cloth, £1 1s. net.

Cicero (Correspondence of) Vol. III. Second Edition. By R. Y. Tyrrell and L. C. Purser. 9"×5 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. cxvi+381. Dublin: University Press; and London: Longmans and Co., 1914. Cloth, 12s.

- Clark* (C. P.) Numerical Phraseology in Virgil. (Dissertation for Doctorate.) 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. 92. Princeton, U.S.A., 1913.
- $\Delta\epsilon\lambda\tau\acute{\iota}\omicron$ τοῦ ἐκπαιδευτικοῦ ὁμίλου, Τομ. 3, Αρ. 1-4. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 344. 'Αθήνα' Ὀδὸς Ἀέκα 4. Δρ. 5.
- Elliott* (R. T.) The Acharnians of Aristophanes. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xl+241. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 14s. net.
- Formigé* (J.) Remarques diverses sur les Théâtres Romains, à propos de ceux d'Arles et d'Orange. 11" $\times$ 9". Pp. 66. Paris: C. Klincksieck, 1914. Fr. 4.50.
- Fowler* (W. W.) Roman Ideas of Deity. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. vii+167. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Frank* (T.) Roman Imperialism. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 6". Pp. xiii+365. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1914. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Gardner* (P.) The Principles of Greek Art. 8" $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xvii+352. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Harris* (R.) Boanerges. 8 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 5 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xxiv+424. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 15s. net.
- Hoffmann* (M.) Die Ethische Terminologie bei Homer, Hesiod, und den alten Elegikern und Iambographen. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 154. Tübingen: Kloeres, 1914.
- Hubbell* (H. M.) The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius, and Aristides. (Doctor's Thesis.) 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xii+72. For the Yale University Press. Oxford: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 5s. 6d. net.
- Klaffenbach* (G.) Symbolae ad Historiam Collegiorum Artificum Bacchiorum (Doctor's Thesis). 9" $\times$ 6". Pp. 76. Berlin: Mayer and Müller, 1914.
- Kühner* (R.) Ausführliche Grammatik der lateinischen Sprache. 2te Auflage. Band II., Teil 2 (completing the work). Neubearbeitet von C. Stegmann. Pp. viii+738. M. 16.50; bound, M. 18.50.
- Latin Verse* (A Selection). By H. D. Wild, G. E. Howes, M. N. Wetmore, J. S. Galbraith, A. M. Dame. 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 5". Yale and Oxford: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Loew* (E. A.) The Beneventan Script: A History of the South Italian Minuscule. 10" $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xx+384. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Cloth, 21s. net.
- Misson* (J., S. J.) Recherches sur le paganisme de Libanios. Université de Louvain: Recueil de travaux publiés par les membres des Conférences d'Histoire et de Philologie: 43° Fascicule. 10" $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xvi+160. Louvain: 40, Rue de Namur; Paris: Picard, 1914. Fr. 5.
- Monist* (The) A Quarterly Magazine devoted to the Philosophy of Science. Vol. XXIV., No. 4. April, 1914. 10" $\times$ 8". Pp. viii+161-320. Chicago: Open Court Publishing Company. 2s. 6d.
- Mossé* (F.) La Laxdaela Saga. Légende historique islandaise, traduite du vieux Norrois. 7 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 4 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xxvi+288. Paris: F. Alcan, 1914. Fr. 3.50.
- Müller* (E.) Cäsaren-Porträts. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ ". Pp. 40. With 4 plates. M. 4; cloth, M. 5.
- Neugebauer* (P. V.) Tafeln für Sonne, Planeten, und Mond, nebst Tafeln der Mondphasen für die Zeit 4000 vor Chr. bis 3000 nach Chr. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xxx+118. Leipzig: Heinrichschen Buchhandlung, 1914. M. 7; cloth, M. 8.
- Ovid*. De Heroidum Codice Gissensi. By H. Roesse. (Doctor's Dissertation.) 10" $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 64. Gissa: Christ and Herr, 1913.
- Pais* (Ettore) Studi Storici per L'Antichita Classica, Vol. VI. Della Nuova Serie, Vol. I. 9 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 6". Pp. 240. Pavia: Mattei and Co., 1913.
- Postma* (F.) De numine divino quid senserit Vergilius. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. viii+220+4. Amsterdam: Van Bottenburg, 1914. Fl. 2.75.
- Rasi* (P.) Gli Studi recenti sull' epistatio di Allia Potestas e la metrica del carme. 9 $\frac{1}{2}$ " $\times$ 6". Pp. 687-733. Venezia: Ferrari, 1914.
- Sachs* (Eva) De Theaeteto Atheniensi Mathematico. (Dissertation for Doctorate.) 9" $\times$ 6". Pp. 72. Berlin: G. Schade (O. Francke), 1914.
- School and College Atlas*. 10" $\times$ 7 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. 112. London: G. W. Bacon and Co., 1914. Cloth, 3s. 6d. net.
- Stenzel* (J.) Über zwei Begriffe der platonischen Mystik Ζῶον und Κίνησις. 11" $\times$ 8". Pp. 24. Breslau: Johannes-Gymnasium, 1914.
- Studies in Philology* (published for the Philological Club of the University of North Carolina. Vol. XI. The Shepherd's Calendar; The Celtic Origin of the Lay of Yonec; A Note on Phormio; the ἐκ τῆς μουσικῆς ἱστορίας. 9" $\times$ 6". Pp. 80. Menasha, Wisconsin: George Banta Co., 1913.
- Terence*, Phormio. Edited by J. Sergeant. 7" $\times$ 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xxiv+129. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 3s.
- Teubner's Texts*. Scholia in Theocritum vetera (C. Wendel), pp. xl+407, M. 12. Sallustii in Ciceronem et invicem Invectivae (A. Kurfess), pp. xvi+27, M. 0.90. Sexti Empirici Opera (H. Mutschmann), Vol. II., pp. xx+429, M. 9. 6 $\frac{1}{4}$ " $\times$ 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914.
- L. Annaei Senecae ad Lucilium Epistulae. Vol. III. 7" $\times$ 4 $\frac{1}{2}$ ". Pp. xxxii+634, M. 6.60. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914.
- Wagner* (H.) Galeni qui fertur libellus ἐκ τῶν τὰ κατὰ γαστρός. (Dissertation for Doctorate.) 9" $\times$ 6". Pp. xxiv+54. Marburg, 1914.
- Zander* (C.) Eurythmia, vel Compositio Rhythmica Prosae Antiquae, exposuit C. Z. II. Numeri Latini aetas integra. 10" $\times$ 6 $\frac{3}{4}$ ". Pp. xl+676. Leipzig: Hassarowitz, 1913.

The Classical Review

AUGUST, 1914

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

THE PERSIAN EXPEDITION TO DELPHI.

THE account which Herodotus gives of the Persian advance southwards from Thermopylae is for the most part undeniably clear and comprehensible. The Delphi episode seems to be treated in a particularly straightforward manner. He describes how the army of Xerxes followed the route along the Boeotian plain and the borders of Phocis: ἐπορεύοντο δὲ ταύτῃ ἀποσχισθέντες τῆς ἄλλης στρατιῆς τῶνδε εἵνεκα, ὅπως συλλήσαντες τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι βασιλεῖ Ξέρξῃ ἀποδέξαιεν τὰ χρήματα.¹

But, without the slightest doubt, this account is both misleading and fallacious. Macan has shown very clearly that Herodotus is merely reproducing the story the Delphians had elaborated in order to apologise for their Medism. The evidence permits of no other conclusion: it can be summarized as follows.²

Delphi was controlled by twelve peoples, of whom nine had gone over to the Persians.³

The oracle had definitely condemned

the Greek plan of action in particular, and the Greek opposition to Persia in general,⁴ in the earlier stages of the war.

Herodotus himself in another place⁵ makes Mardonius say that there was an oracle which prophesied destruction to the Persians if they sacked Delphi, and that therefore the Persians had not attacked, and did not intend to attack, the shrine. But seeing the obvious contradiction to his definite assertion that the Persians had gone to sack Delphi, he somewhat lamely announces that the Mardonius anecdote is meaningless, as the oracle refers to something quite different.

The oracle was definitely on the side of the Greeks who were in the Persian army, for Herodotus describes how an oath was taken that ὅσοι τῷ Πέρσῃ ἔδοσαν σφέας αὐτοὺς Ἕλληνες εἶοντες, μὴ ἀναγκασθέντες, καταστάντων σφί ἐν τῶν πρηγμάτων, τούτους δεκατεῦσαι τᾷ ἐν Δελφοῖσι θεῷ,⁶ thus implying that Delphi was for all practical purposes on the side of Persia,⁷ for such a promise could only mean that they were making a bid for the favour of the oracle.

In the description of the rout of the Persian expeditionary force by the miraculous intervention of Apollo, Herodotus says that after panic had fallen on the

¹ VIII. 35.

² Frazer (*Pausanias*, note to X. 7. 1) maintained that the expedition was a bona-fide attack on the sanctuary. He explains Herodotus IX. 42, as a mere piece of casuistry on the part of Mardonius. 'The supposed contradiction,' he says, 'does not exist.' The Persians did not dread the penalty because they had not actually succeeded in sacking Delphi. But this view cannot be maintained in the face of other evidence.

³ VII. 132.

⁴ VII. 143.

⁵ IX. 42.

⁶ VII. 132.

⁷ This oath is repeated in Diodorus (XI. 3); but, as Macan remarks, the substitution of τοῖς θεοῖς for τῷ ἐν Δελφοῖσι θεῷ is significant. The same change appears in Polybius 9. 39. 5.

enemy, the Delphians' *ἐπικαταβάντες ἀπέκτειναν πλῆθος τι αὐτῶν*. Macan remarks that 'this numerical vagueness (*πλῆθος τι*) is another nail in the coffin of this dead history.'¹

Again, there is considerable external evidence to show that the Persians were careful to spare the great sanctuaries, and that, so far from wishing to despoil them, in many cases they tried to glorify them. Thus Datis in 490 forbade his fleet to stop to ravage Delos, and when he found that the Delians had fled to Tenos on his approach, he not only reassured them and announced that *ἐκ βασιλέως ἐπέσταλται μὴδὲν σίνεσθαι*, but actually made an offering on the altar of 300 talents of incense—a curious preliminary to a war of devastation! Xerxes himself after the Persian occupation of Athens, although he had burnt most of the shrines on the Acropolis, nevertheless repented before he had destroyed everything, and, just as Datis had done at Delos, *συγκαλέσας Ἀθηναίων τοὺς φυγάδας, ἐκέλευε τρόπῳ τῷ σφετέρῳ θῆσαι τὰ ἱρὰ ἀναβάντας ἐς τὴν ἀκρόπολιν*.²

Finally, Herodotus himself clinches the matter by admitting that he relied on Delphian information for his story. *Δελφοὶ λέγουσι*,³ he says, and we are therefore justified in assuming with Macan that 'the Delphian visitation is obviously from a Delphian source, and the story of it a patent apology for the attitude of Delphi in the war, an obvious insertion⁴ in the main draft of the history.'⁵

The conclusion, therefore, in short, is that this expeditionary force detached from the main Persian army did not go to Delphi for the purpose of sacking the temple and sanctuaries, because not only was Delphi a strong partisan of Persia, but also, even if it had not been, the Persians would hardly go out of their way to sack Delphi if they refused to sack Delos, which was directly in their line of advance. The Persian expedition, therefore, to Delphi was not a plundering expedition. The evidence of

topography gives additional support to this conclusion. The route taken by the Persians was either direct from Panopeus and the Boeotian plain, along the pass that goes along the south side of Parnassus to the *Σχιστή* and so up to *Ἀνεμώρεια* (the modern Arachova), and directly from there along the Pleistus valley to Delphi, or else it was from Lilaea across the spurs of Parnassus to the Amphissa valley, and so from the western road to Delphi.⁶ In all probability they came by the latter route and returned by the former. Now in each case the road is so difficult and narrow that only a nominal force of men could reach the sanctuary. The road from Panopeus is easy enough at first, as it goes along a wide and level valley for about four miles, but as soon as it meets the road which goes to Lebadæa it enters a narrow gorge and runs along the right of the river Pleistus, along a rocky ledge barely ten feet wide for some distance until it crosses the valley where the *Σχιστή* is situated, when it becomes easy again. At this narrow gorge an expeditionary force could easily be held up by a handful of men, and no sane general would dream of sending a detachment to a place so well defended for the sake of booty that would be quite superfluous; the Phocians in the Sacred War, it is true, found no difficulty in commanding this road, but the Phocians were the inhabitants of the district and their opponents were elsewhere, while the Persians would have the whole of the inhabitants against them if they attempted to go either to Delphi or from Delphi by this road, and that, as the Gauls found to their cost, was the determining factor in a country such as Phocis. In point of fact, Brennus was defeated probably by these very means in the neighbourhood of this pass by the *Σχιστή*, according to the account of Pausanias. Precisely the same difficulties would beset a force which came to plunder Delphi by the Lilaea-Amphissa road.

We must therefore conclude that the purpose of this expeditionary force was a comparatively peaceful one, or at any

¹ VIII. 38.

² VIII. 54.

³ VIII. 39.

⁴ Macan adduces still further evidence for such an insertion; see his note to VIII. 36. 2. on Amphissa.

⁵ Note to VIII. 35. 8.

Valckenaer reads ΔΙΑΔΙΕΩΝ for ΑΙΟΔΙΔΕΩΝ in Herodotus VIII. 35, and perhaps gives the clue for this route.

rate, such as to render it immune from the very effective opposition which Delphi could have raised against it. If it had come to plunder, Delphi could easily have held all the passes against it no matter how large the force was. Justin¹ declares that the force consisted of 4,000 men, and if he is correct, it shows that they could never have reached Delphi at all had they gone to plunder, for such a force would not stand even a remote chance of getting through the pass before the Σχιστή if it were well guarded.

Before asking, however, what was the real object of this Persian expedition, it is interesting to see how the Delphic apologia for their Medism was gradually transformed during the course of centuries until it became one of the most glorious episodes in the whole war.

Undoubtedly the story given by Herodotus was generally accepted in antiquity. Ctesias² apparently derived it directly from his account, but he gives several additional 'facts' and generally touches up the story. Thus Mardonius is sent in charge of the expedition, and is killed at Delphi by a violent storm of hail—apparently of divine origin. But Ctesias gives a second version as well, which he times after the battle of Plataea and before Salamis. In this version Xerxes orders Megabyzus to lead the expedition. But Megabyzus begs off, and the eunuch Matakas is sent in his place. He sacks the temple and returns.³

In Diodorus⁴ many new and picturesque features appear: he describes how Xerxes despatched a force καὶ προσέταξεν εἰς Δελφοὺς ἵέναι καὶ τὸ μὲν τέμενος τοῦ Ἀπόλλωνος ἐμπρῆσαι τὰ δὲ ἀναθήματα συλῆσαι. The party reached as far as the temple of Athena Pronaia, and then a great storm burst, and thunderbolts fell, and rocks broke off from the cliffs upon the invaders. Thus the sanctuary escaped δαιμονία τινὶ προνοίᾳ, and the priests erected a

τρόπαιον near the temple of Athene, and inscribed a self-laudatory epigram upon it.

The story is thus getting more and more elaborate and interesting, and by the first century A.D. the behaviour of the Delphian shrine must have been represented as still more patriotic, for Plutarch⁵ refers to the occasion when the 'temple at Delphi was burnt down by the Medes,' and the oracle must have been glorious indeed if the Persians were repelled after this.

By the time of Pausanias the oracle seems to have established its position as one of the protagonists of Greece in the Persian War. The priests at Delphi had succeeded in living down the odium of the past by various highly ingenious devices. Thus Pausanias saw a precinct to the hero Phylacus, 'who is commonly said by the Delphians to have stood by them at the time of the Persian invasion,'⁶ and one can well imagine that the priests lost no opportunity of impressing upon visitors the divine assistance which was given them in this mythical crisis. This display of gratitude to the hero Phylacus⁷ for services which he could not possibly have rendered is surely the most comic of pious frauds!

But there were other and subtler ways as well by which the Delphian priests proved their undying hatred of the Mede. Thus Pausanias was told the story of how Themistocles⁸ came to Delphi with spoils of the Medes for Apollo. But the priestess refused to accept them. The explanations of this refusal Pausanias found to be various, but one can quite imagine that the story arose after the death or exile of Themistocles, and that it was but an attempt on the part of the oracle to demonstrate its unimpeachable patriotism by showing how the Pythian priestess refused to deal with a man whom she knew to be on the point of going over to the Persians! It was a case of shifting the accusation!

¹ *Epit. Trog. Pomp.* II. 12. 8. Busolt (2. 2., p. 689) remarks: 'Die Zahl 4000 beruht nur auf Justin-Ephorus und ist selbstverständlich ohne Wert.'

² Περσικῶν, II. 5.

³ See Macan, Appendix, III. 7., p. 235.

⁴ XI. 14.

⁵ Numa, 9.

⁶ X. 8. 7, and cf. Herodotus VIII. 39.

⁷ The ubiquitous Phylacus turns up again at a later date to deter Brennus.

⁸ X. 14. 5.

Again, it seems that Pausanias was shown statues, erected by the Amphictyons, of the diver Scyllis¹ of Scione and his daughter, who had distinguished themselves by dragging away the anchors of the Persian ships during the storm off Mount Pelion. It would be quite a tactical move for those in control of Delphi to court popularity by erecting memorials to the humbler and more neglected luminaries of the Persian War, in order to prove their honest hatred of Persia even in the smallest matters.

Finally, the story recurs with all its main features in the epitome of Justinus.² Four thousand persons were sent to Delphi 'ad templum Apollinis diripiendum prorsus quasi non cum Graecis tantum sed et cum dis immortalibus bellum gereret.' But the force was *totally* destroyed by thunderbolt, 'ut intelligeret quam nullae essent hominum adversum deos vires.'

The development of this plausible apology of the Delphic oracle into an elaborate history is interesting enough, but it does not help us to get to the root of the question and find out what the purpose of the expedition really was.

That the Persians did actually send a force to Delphi there can be no manner of doubt. Herodotus is not in the habit of inventing pure falsehoods for no reason, falsehoods which could be refuted by any of his hearers without a very detailed knowledge of history. No one would benefit by the suppression of the fact that the Persians *did* go to Delphi; on the contrary, the Delphians above all would benefit by its publication more than anybody, for it was an admirable opportunity for composing a story which would redound to their credit.

The problem is therefore to assign a reason for this Persian venture. Here it is that the critics fail us. It is proved most clearly by Macan and others that the Delphians, to hide their own disgrace, made out that the Persians had come to sack Delphi: but it has not yet been shown what was the object of the

expedition if it was not that stated by Herodotus and the Delphians.

The solution perhaps can be found in Herodotus himself. His words are: ἐπορεύοντο δὲ ταύτῃ ἀποσχισθέντες τῆς ἄλλης στρατιῆς τῶνδε εἵνεκα, ὅπως συλήσαντες τὸ ἱρόν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι βασιλεῖ Ξέρξῃ ἀποδέξαιεν τὰ χρήματα. πάντα δ' ἠπίστατο τὰ ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ ὅσα λόγου ἦν ἄξια Ξέρξης, ὡς ἐχὼ πυνθάνομαι, ἄμεινον ἢ τὰ ἐν τοῖσι οἰκίοισι ἔλιπε, πολλῶν αἰεὶ λεγόντων, καὶ μάλιστα τὰ Κροίσου τοῦ Ἀλυσάττεω ἀναθήματα, that is to say, the Persian force went to Delphi for a double purpose—to sack the sanctuary, and to give to Xerxes an ἀπόδειξις of its wealth. Now the rather peculiar form of this statement seems to suggest that the primary object was to be the ἀπόδειξις, while the sacking would be only incidental—the phrase συλήσαντες τὸ ἱρόν is not only subordinate in grammar, it is subordinate also in meaning.

What, therefore, is this ἀπόδειξις which figures so prominently in the account? Perhaps a comparison with other places where the word is used may throw light on what is, as it stands, a strangely obscure sentence. In other passages Herodotus uses the word ἀποδείκνυμι in the sense of 'setting forth an account,' and he uses it in two ways, vaguely as meaning to give a 'general description,' and specifically to mean an actual 'giving of documentary proof,' just as the word 'account' is susceptible of a general and of a 'technical' meaning. Thus in the general sense he refers to a dispute in which each side 'produces' or 'brings forward' proofs of its declarations:³ Moiris, the King of Egypt, is elsewhere referred to as 'setting forth' a list of his achievements.⁴ Similarly Semiramis of Assyria ἀπεδέξατο χώματα ἀνὰ τὸ πεδίον ἔοντα ἀξιόθητα.⁵

In the special 'technical' sense he uses the word in reference to the Persian custom of citizens receiving royal bounties if they 'rendered an account' of their families—the bounty going to him who had the largest family.⁶

³ V. 45., μαρτύρια δὲ τούτων ἐκάτεροι ἀποδείκνυνσι τάδε.

⁴ II. 101., τοῦτον μὲν τοσαῦτα ἀποδέξασθαι.

⁵ I. 184. Here ἀπεδέξατο is practically untranslatable except by periphrasis.

⁶ I. 136. τῷ δὲ τοὺς πλείστους ἀποδείκνυντι δῶρα ἐκπέμπει βασιλεὺς ἀνὰ πᾶν ἔτος.

¹ Pausanias, X. 19. 1, and see Herodotus VIII. 8.

² II. 12. 8.

This double usage of the word in Herodotus is paralleled by Thucydides. It is used by the latter commonly in the first sense. But it is only the 'technical' meaning which is of importance in the present argument. In the latter sense there are two very striking instances. The first¹ refers to the occasion at the outset of the Peloponnesian war, when certain Epidamnian fugitives came to Corcyra *τάφους τε ἀποδεικνύντες καὶ ξυγγένειαν, ἣν προῖσχομενοι ἐδέοντο σφᾶς κατὰγειν*. The second² is the well-known suggestion of Archidamus to the Plataeans that they should give into the hands of the Lacedaemonians their city and a catalogue of their domains, their plantations, and all other property that could be catalogued, as a surety³ for their neutrality in the war; the Spartans retaining them, and undertaking to give them back at the end of the war, if in the meantime the Plataeans preserved a strictly impartial attitude.

Further evidence is provided for this usage of terms by inscriptions. The general semi-metaphorical use of *ἀπόδειξις* or *ἀποδείκνυμι* is of frequent occurrence.⁴ The other meaning, namely, that of a 'list' or 'catalogue,' is given very explicitly in several inscriptions. Thus on one of the beginning of the first century B.C. is a resolution that there shall be a yearly *ἀπόδειξις* and *ἀπολογισμός* in the *βούλη* at Athens, of all the events which have happened *κατὰ τὴν ἀρχὴν* during the course of the year.⁵ In another from Teos⁶ of the third century B.C., concerning a *γυμνάσιον* provision is made that *τὰς ἀποδείξεις ἅς ἔδει γίνεσθαι ἐν τῷ γυμνασίῳ ποιείσθαι τοὺς γραμματοδιδασκάλους*. In another of the second century B.C. found at Peiraeus⁷ it is decreed that accurate re-

cord (*ἀποδείξεις σαφεῖς*) shall be kept of all the pious gifts offered by a certain man to Dionysus. In a Cretan inscription⁸ of the second century B.C. dealing with a dispute between two cities in regard to certain territory, one clause, which unfortunately is partly illegible, refers to certain *ἀποδείξεις* which are to be made in order to provide *ἰσχυροτέραν πίστιν*. Lastly, from Delphi come two inscriptions which give both the noun *ἀπόδειξις* and the verb *ἀποδείκνυμι* in quite unequivocal meaning. The first,⁹ found near the portico of the Athenians, of the third century B.C., enacts that there shall be a record of the sacred officials made every five years (*ἀπόδειξιν τῶν θεωρῶν καθ' ἐκάστην πενταετηρίδα*). The second,¹⁰ also found near the portico of the Athenians, and dated a little earlier than 400 B.C., records the oath of a private man concerning sacred offerings, and in the course of his oath he says, *τὰ χρήματα συμπραξέω καποδείξέω δικαίως τοῖς Λαβυάδαις, κοῦτε κλεψέω οὔτε βλαψέω οὔτε τέχνη οὔτε μηχανᾷ τῶν τῶλ Λαβυαδᾶν χρημάτων*.

The conclusion, therefore, to be drawn from these examples of the usage of the word are that, in addition to the ordinary loose sense of the word, *ἀπόδειξις* also had a very definite semi-technical meaning: and further, that an actual *ἀπόδειξις* was for all practical purposes a catalogue or inventory.

From Herodotus himself the word appears clearly to mean a plain and definite statement of fact, amounting in some cases to an official list.

From the two passages of Thucydides quoted above *ἀπόδειξις* seems to have acquired a more specialised meaning, being used to mean the inventory of property which a state or city was prepared to hand over to a belligerent, with the understanding that the possession of such a list would imply also the possession of at least the protectorate over the properties designated in it. The Epidamnian fugitives in the one case offered as a pledge¹¹ their *τάφους* and the material evidences of their

¹ I. 26.

² II. 72. *ὕμεις δὲ πόλιν μὲν καὶ οἰκίας ἡμῖν παράδοτε τοῖς Λακεδαιμονίοις καὶ γῆς ὄρους ἀποδείξατε καὶ δένδρα ἀριθμῶ τὰ ὑμέτερα καὶ ἄλλα εἴ τι δυνατόν ἐς ἀριθμὸν ἐλθεῖν.*

³ *ἔξομεν παρακαταθήκην.*

⁴ Cf. *C.I.G.* 1543—*παρασχομένων τῶν κατηγορῶν ἀληθινὰς ἀποδείξεις*—in a trial for a death penalty. Cf. also *B.C.H.*, xx., p. 623, No. 2, line 19 (an inscription from Delphi), and *B.C.H.* v., p. 372, No. 3, line 4, and elsewhere.

⁵ *C.I.A.*, ii. 467.

⁶ Dittenberger, *Syll.*, 523. 32.

⁷ *C.I.A.*, iv. 2, p. 169, n. 623e.

⁸ Dittenberger, *Syll.*, 929. 133.

⁹ *B.C.H.*, v., p. 306, line 29.

¹⁰ *B.C.H.*, xix., p. 6, line 5, *et seq.*

¹¹ *προῖσχομενοι* in Thuc. I. 26 can have no other meaning but this.

συγγένεια with Corcyra: in the other the Plataeans, according to the suggestion of Archidamus, are to render up to him an inventory of their property, such inventory to imply that the property described in it is transferred to him and that it will be returned to the Plateans if they keep their part of the bargain—namely, if they preserve neutrality. If they ceased to be neutral, of course Archidamus could destroy or expropriate everything described in the inventory; if they remained neutral, the inventory would enable them to make sure that the Lacedaemonians had acted fairly by them, for they could check off each separate property and be certain that nothing had been damaged or unfairly taken from them.

The various inscriptions quoted above serve to verify this special technical meaning which ἀπόδειξις has acquired. The coupling in one instance of ἀπόδειξις with ἀπολογισμός shows that it had some meaning roughly equivalent to 'inventory'.¹ That an ἀπόδειξις was a guarantee of good faith seems suggested by the occurrence in another inscription of the phrase ἰσχυροτέραν πίστιν τῆς τούτων . . . ἐχρη, though the imperfect state of the text makes it impossible to understand the precise relation of the two. Finally, the association in the fifth-century inscription from Delphi of the word ἀποδειξέω with a sworn declaration not to commit theft or larceny of any sort, still further amplifies the view that an ἀπόδειξις was a guarantee of good faith.

Now an application of all these inferences from external evidence to the passage of Herodotus where he describes the expedition to Delphi leads to the following conclusion.

Since the expedition did not go for the purpose of sacking the temple, its object was to draw up a new inventory of the Delphian property, for the purpose of ensuring the strict neutrality of the oracle and its partisans by holding its property in pledge, just as apparently the Epidamnians suggested could be done to their property by Corcyra, and

as the Plateans might have done to Archidamus, had they followed his advice. Herodotus, however, adds πάντα δ' ἡπίστατο τὰ ἐν τῷ ἱρῷ ὅσα λόγου ἦν ἄξια Ξέρξης, which may mean that Xerxes had had an inventory made on a previous occasion, and had sent this expedition not to make an inventory for the first time, but to make a new revised inventory and to verify the old one. It is quite conceivable that the Delphians at an earlier stage in the war had sent to Xerxes such a document, for the purpose of gaining immunity without the scandal of publicly declared Medism. On the other hand, πάντα δ' ἡπίστατο may really refer to the time after the expedition had been to Delphi, in which case its object would be to make an inventory for the first and only time, and not to make a revised inventory. The amplification of the remark—καὶ μάλιστα τὰ Κροίσου τοῦ Ἀλυάττεω ἀναθήματα—would therefore appear to be merely a touch of Herodotean rationalism in order to explain a statement which, since he had not an inkling of its real meaning, was naturally rather obscure to him.

The object of the expedition, therefore, being to make out this ἀπόδειξις, and Xerxes being thus in possession of information which he either then obtained for the first time or else verified from a previously existing document, the subordinate phrase—συλήσαντες τὸ ἱρὸν τὸ ἐν Δελφοῖσι—obviously cannot harmonise with the rest of the sentence. Why he wrote it one cannot say: it can only be explained on the assumption that he was in possession of two different accounts furnished by the Delphians. The one account was the orthodox Delphian apology, namely, that the Persians had set out with the intention only of sacking Delphi. The other was obviously the unorthodox account that really hinted at the truth, and which had therefore been suppressed and interpreted in such a way that it had dwindled down into the vague story that Xerxes knew all about the contents of the sanctuary.

The two accounts, of course, cannot possibly be reconciled: Herodotus saw this, and that is why he tries to explain that this intimate knowledge of the

¹ Cf. Luc. *Demosth.* 33, and *C.I.G.* 3598, line 33, where ἀπολογισμός means 'the rendering of a statement of account.'

temple properties was really confined to those things which Xerxes had heard about in Persia—for that is obviously the impression that he wished to give. In other words, he is trying to reject the one account and strengthen the other. But the account he is trying to reject is based on such strong evidence that he cannot in honesty eliminate it altogether: the phrases *ὡς ἐγὼ πυνθά-νομαι* and *πολλῶν αἰεὶ λεγόντων* are introduced, it seems, almost by way of apology: he was unable to omit things upon which he had heard so much, despite the confusion that he causes in the orthodox story by repeating these dark tales.

The expedition was either to draw up an *ἀπόδειξις* or to sack the temple. To do both would be obviously absurd; to go to the trouble of making an inventory

of the stolen goods would be quite meaningless and wholly unnecessary.

The version, therefore, which is the true one is that Xerxes sent¹ this expedition to secure the neutrality of Delphi by an *ἀπόδειξις*—a regular and not uncommon method of procedure in ancient warfare. It was an action which would not only please the Delphians most, by giving them the benefit of Medism without its publicity, but would also harmonise most with the traditions of generosity in religious matters which obtained in the Persian army.

S. CASSON.

British School, Athens.

¹ Perhaps Xerxes went himself with the expedition to Delphi; Macan suggests this in his note to VIII. 35. 8.

PROSE RHYTHM IN WELSH AND ENGLISH: WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO THE LATIN CURSUS.

IN a recent lecture (*Prose Rhythm in English*, Clarendon Press, 1913: cp. the same writer's *The Corsus in Mediaeval and Vulgar Latin*, Oxford, 1910), Mr. A. C. Clark touches upon certain points in which the rhythms of Biblical English tally with those favoured by the mediaeval *cursus*. There is mediaeval authority for ending a clause or sentence in one or other of three ways: (1) the *cursus planus*, consisting of five syllables with accents on the first and fourth, e.g. *voces testántur* (or, in English, *sérvants depárted*); (2) the *tardus*, of six syllables, also with accents on the first and fourth, e.g. *méa curátio* (or, *pérfect felicity*); (3) the *velox*, of seven syllables, with accents on the first and sixth, e.g. *gáudia pervenire* (or, *glórious undertáking*). After giving these examples, Mr. Clark adds that the accentual clausulae were preceded by a system in which quantity, not stress, played the chief part. Thus *voces testántur* was preceded by *vōcē tēstātūr*, *méa curátio* by *nōstrā cūrātīō*, and *gáudia pervenire* by *gāudīūm pērvēnīrē*. 'This metrical system was shown [by various scholars] to go back to classical Latin prose, and to be present in the writings of Cicero himself. Meanwhile

patient workers had been tabulating the endings of Cicero's sentences, and arrived independently at the result that his favourite forms were exactly those which correspond to the three forms of the *cursus*. These may be reduced to a single formula, viz. a cretic base with a trochaic cadence of varying length.¹ This, however, was no new invention of Latin writers: like everything else it came from Greece.'

If we open the Welsh Bible, as published by Bishop Richard Parry in 1620,² and read the short 46th Psalm, we shall have no difficulty in finding rhythms which correspond to those described above as *planus*, *tardus*, and *velox*. It may be well to transcribe the whole Psalm, with the exception of the eleventh verse which repeats the seventh, and to mark all accented syllables:

Verse 1 Dúw sydd nóddfa, a nérth i ni (tardus), cýmorth háwdd ei gáel mewn cyfýngder (planus). V. 2 Am hýnny nid ófnwn pe symmúdai y ddáiar (planus), a

¹ The last syllable is always *anceps* as in verse.

² The rhythms of Bishop Parry's version will be found to correspond closely with those of Bishop Morgan's (1588).

phe tréiglid y mynŷddoedd i gánol y mór (no equivalent in the 'cursus,' of which no form ends with an accented syllable). V. 3 Er rhúo a therfŷscu o'i¹ ddyfroedd (planus), er crŷnu o'r mynŷddoedd gan ei ymchŷydd ef (velox). V. 4 Y mae áfon, a'i ffŷydau a lawenhánt ddinas Ddúw (no equivalent); cŷssegr presswylféydd y Gorúchaf (planus). V. 5 Dúw sydd yn ei chánol, nid ŷscog hi (tardus): Dúw a'i cynnorthŷya yn fóreu iáwn (no equivalent). V. 6 Y cenhédloedd a derfŷscásant (velox), y teyrnásoedd a ŷscogásant (velox): efe a róddes ei léf, tóddodd y ddáiar (planus). V. 7 Y mae Árglwydd y llúoedd gyd á ni (no equivalent): y mae Dúw Jácob yn amddeffŷfa i ni (no equivalent). V. 8 Deúwch, gwélwch weithrédoedd yr Árglwydd (planus): pa anghyfanédd-dra a wnaeth efe ar y ddáiar (velox). V. 9 Gwná i ryfeloedd béidio hyd éithaf y ddáiar (planus), efe a ddrŷllia'r bŷa (planus), ac a dŷrr y wáywffon (no equivalent), efe a lŷsc y cerbŷdau á thán (no equivalent). V. 10 Péidiwch, a gwybŷddwch mai myfŷ sydd Ddúw (no equivalent): derchéfir fi ym mŷsc y cenhédloedd (planus), derchéfir fi ar y ddáiar (velox).

The same Psalm, taken verse by verse in the English Authorised Version, will give the following approximate results at the corresponding places: V. 1, no equivalent: no equivalent. V. 2, planus: no equivalent. V. 3, planus: no equivalent. V. 4, no equivalent: no equivalent. V. 5, planus (?): velox (?). V. 6, no equivalent: planus (kingdoms were moved): no equivalent. V. 7, no equivalent: no equivalent. V. 8, no equivalent: no equivalent. V. 9, no equivalent: no equivalent: velox: velox (?). V. 10, no equivalent: velox: no equivalent.

It will be seen that the English translation offers the Latin rhythms of the *cursus* in some eight places, the Welsh in some sixteen. Resemblances between Latin and English rhythms have been discussed by a good many writers, and notably by men to whose ears the Authorised Version had long been familiar (Bishop Hurd, 1721-1808; John Mason, a Nonconformist minister, 1706-1763; Mr. John Shelly, in the *Church Quarterly Review*, April, 1912). But I am not aware that similar resemblances between Latin and Welsh rhythms have hitherto been studied, nor do I feel that questions of this kind would repay any prolonged investigation. It may, however, be worth while asking why, in a Psalm chosen almost at random, the Welsh points of contact with the *cursus* should so greatly out-

number the English. The chief reason is, I believe, to be found, as might be expected, in the nature of the three languages themselves, and particularly in the greater variety of our English vocabulary.

We need constantly to be reminded how much more monosyllabic English is than Latin. In the Vulgate rendering of Psalm xlv. only one word in four is a monosyllable,² and many of the polysyllables are of considerable length; in the Authorised English Version of the same Psalm four words in every five are monosyllables. The Welsh Version of the Psalm has a distinctly smaller proportion of monosyllables than the English: three words (as against four) in every five are monosyllabic. But, for the dactylic purposes of the *cursus*, Welsh gains through having a larger proportion of *unaccented* monosyllables than English has.³ I do not claim that this feature of its vocabulary is, in itself, any advantage for Welsh. On the contrary, it is a great strength to a language to have an ample store of stressed monosyllables whose sound and meaning are alike impressive: e.g., *love, faith, hope, sleep*. These four English words are taken at a venture, and it is interesting to notice that only two of the ordinary Welsh equivalents are monosyllables: *cariad, ffydd, gobaith, cwsg*. Milton's *Paradise Lost* was translated into Welsh, during the latter half of the nineteenth century, by the late John Evans (I. D. Ffraid). This Welsh version (*Coll Gwynfa*) has many merits. But it follows the metre of the original, and in consequence its lines are continually found to end in unimportant and unaccented monosyllables — prepositions and pronouns in particular. An effective combination in Welsh (though unsuitable for a translation of *Paradise Lost*) is the 'cywydd' couplet, consisting of seven syllables in each line with the final accent placed alternately on the ultimate and penultimate, and so allowing free play to monosyllables and

² In the LXX one word in two or three is a monosyllable, the monosyllabic article in its various cases making much difference.

³ Cp. Welsh and English instances of *planus* (W. 9, E. 4) and *tardus* (W. 2, E. o) in Ps. xlv.

¹ o'i and a'i are monosyllables.

polysyllables alike while not overworking the former, e.g.:

Deuddyn un enaid óeddynt,
Dau ffyddlon, un galon gýnt.

Infinite variety is the first artistic essential in matters of this kind. How much is gained by the use of 'tabernacles' and 'desolations,' rather than shorter words such as 'tents' and 'voids,' among the prevailing monosyllables in the Authorised Version of Psalm xlv. : how much, again, by the combination of short and long words in 'Never he will not: | Age cannot wither her, nor custom stale | Her infinite variety.' How lamentable it would be to re-write all Shakespeare's lines on the model of 'The multitudinous seas incarnardine,' or (on the other side) to perform the schoolboy exercise of substituting monosyllables for the words in Tennyson's *Ulysses* that are not monosyllables already. These points are obvious enough, but in regard to rhythm the principle of variety seems sometimes to be underrated. In English prose the following brief sentence from Bacon's *Essay Of Death* should, just because of its irregular stresses, be admitted to be admirable in sound as in sense: 'It is wóthy the óbsérving, that there is nó pássion in the mínd of mán só weák, but it mátes and másters the feár of deáth.' This sentence, if it stood alone, would serve to show that, whereas generally the juxtaposition of several stressed or unstressed English syllables (as of several long or short syllables in Latin or Greek) will be avoided, yet variety itself (not to speak of special rhetorical effects) demands that there should be no absolute 'rule' to this effect. The concurrence of three stressed syllables in 'Nó pássion in the mínd of mán só weák' may be compared with a similar rhythm in the Welsh of Psalm xlv. 4, 'a lawenhânt ddínas Ddúw.' In both cases each important word is stressed, and the thought has the fullest effect given to it through the several elements standing out separately and alone. In commenting (p. 12) on the rhythmical effect in the *Confession* of the conflicting accents in, *We have erred and strayed from thy wáys, líke lóst sheép*, Mr. Clark says that 'here the stressed mono-

syllables produce the effect of a wail.' The main result would seem, rather, to be to press home the comparison word by word: just as the individuality of the lost wanderers is brought out by the relatively long notes in Handel's setting of 'We have turned every *one to his own way*.'

One enemy of variety in Latin, in Welsh, and in English, is the native tendency to a trochaic cadence, and a good writer or speaker will in consequence be afraid of too much rhythm creeping in rather than too little. The strongly trochaic bent of Welsh does not need further illustration; it sufficiently appears in the rhythmical analysis already given of Psalm xlv. and follows naturally from the fact that in Welsh polysyllables the accent falls almost invariably on the penultimate, whereas in modern English there is a marked tendency to stress the antepenultimate or a still earlier syllable. As regards the other two languages Mr. Clark (p. 18) says: 'There is a striking point of similarity [in Latin and English], namely, the trochaic cadence, which is a characteristic of both languages. This was modified in Latin by the cretic base which precedes the trochaic movement, and the use of harsher measures in the middle of the clauses. The trochaic rhythm is chiefly found in the *clausula*, and does not generally extend further than over a few syllables. In English the trochaic movement pervades the whole sentence, and frequently produces the effect of blank verse.' Mr. Clark elsewhere chooses an instance of marked trochaic cadence from the *Te Deum*: 'We, thérefore, práy thee, hélp thy sérvants, whóm thou hást redeémed with thy précious blóod.'¹ This is

¹ With the exception of 'redeemed' (accented on the penultimate), all the words here are either disyllables (accented on the penultimate) or monosyllables (some of which are stressed). As already indicated, Welsh is still more prone to fall into trochaic rhythms because its polysyllables are, more commonly than in English (or in Latin), accented on the penultimate. It is, indeed, not too much to say that, in Welsh, the accent never falls before the penultimate except in a few modernisms not recognised in the stricter literary language. By a good reader, who respects the thought most of all and has regard to phrases (i.e., utterances made without pause) rather than to metrical feet, English

elevated, semi-poetical, prose; and, even in its context, it is exceptional and all the more moving because exceptional. Modern writers on prose rhythm sometimes omit to distinguish between the many different kinds of prose. On historical and intrinsic grounds we expect more rhythm in prose that is poetical and emotional in character, and is addressed specially to the ear. A speaker will welcome 'harsher measures' in the middle, if only for the practical reason that the final cadences will then stand out the more, and give to his discourse the clearness of punctuation. And, in itself, variety will seem as appropriate to most prose as recurrence to most verse. Hence, when Mr. Saintsbury (*History of English Prose Rhythm*, p. 103), in referring to the fact that in Old English the rhythm is mainly trochaic, speaks of a 'continuous trochaic roll which at the end of lines is practically omnipresent,' we must take him to be illustrating the practice in modern prose rather than approving it. The curious will notice that elsewhere (p. 283, n. 1) in the same volume he is content with a double trochee at the end of his sentence, and earlier in its course writes *almost omnipresent* rather than *practically omnipresent*: 'giving that juxtaposition of paeon (chiefly third) and amphibrach which will be found almost omnipresent in Gibbon, and which may be a proximate cause of his peculiar undulation.' As the art of prose advances, greater freedom of rhythm is attained, though rhythm there still remains. Chaucer's prose may be distinguished from his poetry by the absence of rhyme, but metrically it might often pass for blank verse. Malory, on the other hand, escapes blank verse when he uses the word *damsel*, and not *maid*, in 'and so Sir Lancelot and the damsel departed.'¹

Coming to more modern times, Mr.

prose will usually be saved from undue cadence. The passage of the *Te Deum* might well be read, 'whom-Thou-hast-redéemed with-Thy-précious blood,' the main stress being thrown on the central syllable of 'redeemed.' In the delivery of verse itself the thought is the best guide for the average reader, since, as Caesar said, *si cantas, male cantas; si legis, cantas*.

¹ This assumes that Malory did not write 'damosel.'

Clark (whose lecture is full of interesting and disputable matter) regards Macaulay's rhythm as very classical, and he analyses with zest the following sentence: 'And there the ladies whose lips more persuasive than those of Fóx himself (4) had carried the Westminster election (1) against pálace and treásury (2) shóne round Geórgiána (? 3), Dúchess of Dévonshire (2).' He proceeds: 'Geórgiána here is a beautiful double-trochee, and I am rather surprised that Macaulay did not complete the rhythm by writing *shóne around*, in which case the clausula would have been wholly Latin.' The phrase 'complete the rhythm' seems to show that Mr. Clark looks for more system, more conscious obedience to classical precedent, than is really there. Macaulay would hardly think the whole thing out, but if challenged he would no doubt have defended the rhythm *shóne round* as characteristically English and forcible. Measured utterance seems to have been Macaulay's birthright: it did not need the education of school or college, though it may have owed something to the Biblical language of his home. When he was taking refreshment somewhere as a youthful guest of four or five summers, a careless servant spilt hot coffee over his legs. After a while, his hostess asked him how he felt. The reply was: 'Thank you, madam, the agony is abated.' Some two years later, when his mother explained to him that he must study at school without the creature comforts to which he was accustomed at home, he answered with due regard to rhythm and antithesis, 'Yes, mama, industry shall be my bread and attention my butter.' It seems not unreasonable to suppose that Mr. Clark, who denotes varieties of the *cursus* not only by numerals but by letters so disquieting as the unmusical combination $\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon\zeta$, could devise a formula to fit these early impromptus of Macaulay. The combination $\beta\gamma\delta\epsilon\zeta$ seems to denote little more than an accentual double-dactyl: the example given is, *shíne for thy líght is come*. Mr. Clark, who has so much to say about accumulated trochees, might have said more than he does about accumulated dactyls, of which some English accentual examples (pos-

sibly influenced not only by the *cursus*, but by the classical hexameter, though the fundamental differences between accentual and quantitative metres have always to be borne in mind), are quoted in the Introduction (p. 37) to my edition of Dionysius *de Compositione Verborum*. The best ancient writers on prose rhythm would condemn a run of dactyls as they condemned a run of trochees. The double trochee was regarded as *Asiatic* by Cicero and Quintilian (*ib.* p. 53). In English, the dactyl adds variety, if nothing more, to the ómniprésent tróchee. Welsh suffers through a lack of those long dactylic words derived from Latin which enriched English late on in its history; and native dactylic (or anapaestic) rhythms are apt to vanish under the hand of a compositor, or reader for the press, who, in order to avoid hiatus at all costs, will write 'pe symmudai'r ddaear' for 'pe symmudai y ddaear' in Psalm xlv. 2.¹ In the eternal flux of the English as of other languages, dactyls are continually being lost: *Julian*, for example, becomes a trochee, and so with the latter part of *salv|ation*. To make up for this, words like *contrary*, *balcony*, *doctrinal*, *contem|plate*, have their accent shifted from the penultimate to the antepenultimate and so join the ranks of dactyls.

In comparing modern with classical prose, Mr. Clark might well have written more fully than he does about the parallel between rhythmical prose and lyric poetry. At the beginning of his lecture he says: 'In this respect [viz., in its greater freedom] prose is said to resemble lyric poetry, a very suggestive remark.' In a paragraph showing less than his usual lucidity, he does not make it clear that the reference is to Cicero's *Orator* (c. 55). If the passage of Cicero be read in connexion with Dionysius *de Compositione* (c. 26), points which bring numerous prose nearer to lyrical than other kinds of verse will be found to be the use, in lyric poetry, of more varied metres, together with the freer practice of *enjambement*. Historically, the observation is interesting, when we recall the

comparative dates of the lyrical poets, and of the earlier prose-writers, of Greece.² And it is one illustration the more of the fact that variety is the keynote of prose rhythm.

The praises of variety are rehearsed by Isocrates, Dionysius (his *διαπεποικιλται* is more significant than Mr. Clark perceives), Quintilian, and other ancient writers. Cicero himself sees the danger of sameness, and does not succumb to it so completely in practice as Zielinski's often violent and fallacious attempts at cast-iron system might seem to indicate. Cicero's theory is well put in the *Orator* § 214, and may be stated and qualified as follows. A good speaker will appeal to ear as well as mind. But the ear itself is soon sated by a continually recurring rhythm, however pleasing that rhythm may be when used in moderation. And if the ear demands variety, so does the mind, though for another reason. Precision of statement is apt to be sacrificed to harmony (or what passes for harmony) when clauses and sentences are bound to end in certain prescribed rhythms. Cicero does not make this admission, but proof can be found in some of his own speeches, and one does not wonder that the mind of Caesar and of the best historians of Rome distrusted prose numbers.³ The

² Thrasymachus, one of the earliest writers on prose numbers, commended the paeon. The recurrence of the long syllables would be less marked in paeonic than in iambic, trochaic, or dactylic measures. At the end of the classical period, Aristotle also advocated the paeon for prose use. In any comparison of Latin rhythm with Greek, it must be remembered that the Latin language was undactylic, and that its dactylic poetry was developed late (not early, as in Greece) and by a *tour de force*. Even English can be more dactylic (in the accentual way) than Latin: compare such words as 'felicity' and 'adversity' with their Latin originals. A scrupulous writer, like Virgil, will not (I think) use *patria* as a dactyl, though it may help in forming the latter part of one. Again, such a word as *filia* presents in its oblique cases a problem which finds a spondaic solution in *gnatae* and the like. When accent took the place of quantity in Latin, the *cursus* could manufacture dactyls with terrible facility. It was easy for the *cursus* to employ accentually dactylic rhythms, as it had been for Cicero to avoid quantitatively dactylic rhythms.

³ In this, as in other ways, one sometimes feels that Cicero was more Italian than Roman.

¹ *Y ddaear*, Morgan and Parry; '*r ddaear*', Welsh Book of Common Prayer (Oxford, 1854).

rigid *cursus* itself, that 'reductio ad absurdum' of Ciceronian practice, was destined to be laughed out of court when the European mind which it had helped to lull awoke once more. And though, in treating of modern English prose, Mr. Clark may seem, here and there, to speak too much of 'law,' 'rule,' 'system,' 'recurrence,' and 'positive results,' his own main conclusion is on the side of variety. A 'positive result' which he modestly hopes himself to have reached is one with which no believer in variety would be inclined to quarrel. Following the lead of Mr. Saintsbury, he maintains that the native elements in English (*viz.*, the trochaic roll and the stressed monosyllable: these elements he seeks to disengage by an original method of remainders) have combined with the exotic (*viz.*, the imported Latin cadences). 'The rhythm of English is mixed, like the nation itself, and the mixture constitutes its charm.'

It is pleasant to note that the new Corpus Professor of Latin at Oxford unites with those more austere and scientific qualities which are attested by his larger works the fine literary taste and wide human interests which appear in his occasional writings. Certainly no trouble is misspent which helps a scholar to recapture the authentic harmonies of the old Roman tongue and

At all events, his tendency to uniform cadence was not countenanced by the more characteristic public oratory whether of Rome or Greece.

to compare them aptly with those of his own. It is not a question of rhythm only, though that is an important point. In modern times, a visitor to the Austrian Tyrol may think that he sees much of the difference between North and South Europe in two legends, meant to bear the same meaning, which are placed in front of those blatant motor-omnibuses that carry German and Italian passengers from pass to pass upon the confines of the sundering Alps: *Das Sprechen mit dem Wagenführer ist verboten*, and *È vietato parlare col conduttore*. The German is forbidding (as here it should be); the Italian is seductive (as here it should not be). The Italian cadence seems to approach the *velox*; the German cadence is non-descript. But, most of all, we feel the contrast between the Southern vowel-endings and the Teutonic consonantal endings. This contrast is not inevitable. The resources of our Northern languages may, in some ways, be comparatively slender. But a master of his instrument will not find the organ so unmelodious that out of its strength no sweetness can come forth. In German, a poet can say, *Du bist wie eine Blume*; in English, *Come live with me, and be my love*; in Welsh, *Dos di ati, dywed wrthi*. Professor Clark knows well the power and charm both of English and of the classic tongues, and will, I doubt not, win many of his hearers to be lifelong 'amatores antiquitatis.' CARED DOETH YR ENCILION.

W. RHYS ROBERTS.

NOTES

PINDAR NEM. III. 3: A REPLY.

ὑδατι γὰρ
μένοντ' ἐπ' Ἀσωπίῳ μελιγαυρὸν τέκτονες
κόρυμν ἑαρίαι, σέθεν ὅπα μαιόμενοι.

'A CONTRIBUTOR to *Essays and Studies* presented to William Ridgeway, p. 222, who suggests that the words ὑδατι ἐπ' Ἀσωπίῳ may mean "the sea around Aegina," has to thank Mr. Lendrum for indirectly re-inforcing her argument by his note in the last number of the

Classical Review (p. 86). He writes: 'It seems impossible to suppose that Pindar, in a context dealing with a Nemean victory,¹ could speak of "the water of Asopus" and not refer to the celebrated Phliasian stream, which is as closely connected with Nemea as is the Alpheus with Olympia.' Now, to begin with, there is not the same *local* connection;

¹ Rather, 'in a Nemean Ode.' The context deals with *Aegina*; hence the problem.

the valley of the Asopus is divided by the ridge of Trikaranon from the Nemean Vale; and I might have pointed out that if Pindar's Chorus were 'waiting by the Asopus,' they could not be at Nemea—*alors, que diable allaient-ils faire sur cette rivière?* It happens that Bacchylides' sole reference to the river illustrates this point; he says (VIII. 39) that Automedes of Phlius, having won at Nemea, 'returned to the Asopus.'

But where do we find Nemea anywise 'connected with the celebrated Phliasian stream'? Mr. Lendrum cites *Nem.* IX. 9: *ἰππίων ἀέθλων κορυφάν, ἅτε Φοῖβω θῆκεν Ἀδραστος ἐπ' Ἀσωποῦ ῥεέθροισ.* This must be an oversight; *Nem.* IX. is not a Nemean, and the Games in question are the Pythia at Sicyon. Excluding our passage as disputed, that is Pindar's only reference to the Phliasian Asopus; contrast his thirteen references to the Alpheus in connection with Olympia. Bacchylides, as I have said, mentions the river once, and then dissociates it from Nemea; true, we have only three of his Nemeans, but contrast his celebrating the Alpheus in every one of his four extant Olympians. These facts seem to dispose of the objection that Pindar, when he speaks of 'the Asopian Water' in a Nemean ode, *must* be referring to the Asopus.

Let me, in turn, object to Mr. Lendrum that his alleged 'close connection,' so consistently ignored by Pindar and Bacchylides, existed only in the imagination of Alexandrian commentators,¹ whose topography was hazy, and who therefore assumed that *ῥεέθροισ ἐπ' Ἀσωπίῳ* could mean *ἐν Νεμέῃ*. That is precisely the assumption on which Mr. Lendrum's own explanation is founded.

Pindar, he suggests, is here employing a 'mannerism,' whereby, when he means that he is celebrating an exploit, 'he sometimes expresses this by saying that he is *at* the place where the exploit occurred.' So here, 'when Pindar says that the Chorus in Aegina is waiting for the voice of the Muse by the Water of Asopus, he means nothing more than

that it is waiting to sing on the subject of a Nemean victory.' Let us grant this 'mannerism' for the moment²; let us further concede that Pindar could employ it, somewhat inartistically, in reference to the visibly present performers of an Ode. Let us suppose that when the Chorus entreated the Muse to come to Aegina *because they were waiting for her in another place*, the audience would understand that they merely meant 'We are waiting to sing of an exploit that occurred in another place.' Very well; but *ex hypothesi*, the Chorus ought to say that they are at Nemea; instead of which, they say, according to Mr. Lendrum, that they are by the Asopus. Then they are waiting to sing not a Nemean, but a Phliasian or Sicyonian victory. For while *ῥεέθροισ ἐπ' Ἀσωπίῳ* could quite naturally mean either 'at Phlius' or 'at Sicyon' to Pindar and his contemporaries, that it could mean 'at Nemea,' I think may safely be denied.

W. M. L. HUTCHINSON.

ΗΣΣΕ AS EVIDENCE FOR ἜΣΣΕ.

PROFESSOR SKUTSCH (*Glotta* III. 386), recanting his previous support of Vollmer's attack on the credibility of *ἔσσε*, called attention to the transcription *ησσε* as one of two facts 'wodurch Donat und Priscian glänzend gerechtfertigt werden'; and I have followed him in accepting this as evidence (*Classical Review*, June, 1913, p. 122). Professor Sonnenschein now (*Classical Review*, August, 1913, p. 161) expresses surprise that any weight should be attached to this transcription in a series of documents so full of inconsistencies

² I have not space to discuss Mr. Lendrum's examples, but must demur to his translating *Isôhm.* I. 4: *μη μοι κραναά νεμεσάσαι* | *Δῶλος, ἐν ᾗ κέχυμαι*: 'may I escape the wrath of Delos, *where I have drifted*.' He compares *Pyth.* IV. 43, 'where the same words are used literally of the clod which . . . drifted to the shore of Thera: *καὶ νῦν ἐν τᾷδ' ἀφθιτον νάσφ κέχυται* *Λιβύας* | *εὐρυχόρου σπέρμα*.' There seems some confusion here. Medea has already said that the clod *drifted*—*ὑγρῷ πελάγει σπομένην* (l. 40); she now says that the 'seed is *strown*' on Thera, *i.e.* the clod has been *cast ashore* there.

¹ *E.g.*, Aristarchus. See my discussion of his explanation, *loc. cit.*

and blunders. I may therefore be permitted to state briefly why I still regard it as a not unimportant bit of corroborative evidence; and in particular I must refuse to accept the specious dilemma in which Professor Sonnenschein leaves me with his closing words: 'Either the cursing tablets are evidence, and then go to show that the *e* of words like *furens* was short; or they are no evidence, and then cannot be quoted in support of a long *e* in *esse*, "to eat."' Even the most slovenly written documents deserve to be treated with some discrimination, and their characteristics are not necessarily all of equal value or worthlessness in evidence. It is plain that in the tablets in question, as in many other examples of Latin in Greek transcription, Latin *e* and *o* were frequently transcribed letter for letter by *ε* and *ο* without regard to their quantity. Professor Sonnenschein has cited many instances in which *ε* and *ο* answer to Latin *ē* and *ō*, two of them, ο[υ]ιδερετ (*vidēret*) and νου (*nōn*), in the same inscription which contains ησσε. Does it follow that the less frequent transcriptions of η and ω were also used indiscriminately for the Latin long and short vowels? Professor Sonnenschein cites one example of η for short *e*, ουξηριτ (*vixerit*), also εγω (*egō*), which is apparently due to the familiar appearance of the Greek form,¹ and σωαδ . . . which he thinks represents some form of *sōdalis*, but which is wholly obscure. I have also noted οβλιγην-τουρ (*obligentur*) following οβλιγητουρ and a whole series of third singular forms in -ητουρ (*-ētur*), quoted below. With these few exceptions, η and ω are employed only for the Latin long vowels—e.g., in No. 231 κουω (*quō*), [κου]ωρουμ (*quōrum*), ρηγis (*rēgis*), ινη-τουρ (*inētur*), δητινεατουρ (*dētineatur*), ουως (*vōs*), νεκεσσι[τατ]ης (*necessitatēs*), διη (*diē*), ωρας (*hōra*), τωτα (*tōta*), [α]νιμω (*animō*), αμωρε (*amōre*); in No. 252 ινπλικητουρ (*implicētur*), οβλιγητουρ (*obligētur*), νημινεμ (*nēmīnem*), βουλνερ-ητουρ (*vulnerētur*), σανγουινητουρ (*sanguinētur*).

¹ In this tablet, Audollent No. 270, the same in which φουρενς occurs, there is no other example of ω and none of η, the Latin long and short vowels alike being transcribed by *ε* and *ο* (με, αμωρε, etc.).

guinētur); in No. 267 (the one containing ησσε), κωριτε (*cōgite*), αμωρε σακρω (*amōre sacrō*), ιτερμισσιωνε (*intermissione*), διηβους (*diēbus*). Are we to reckon ησσε as one of the rare exceptions or as another example of the regular use of η? It is obvious that, regardless of all other evidences, the chances are ten to one that it goes with the normal cases and is intended to represent *esse*. I am at a loss to see how anyone can fail to recognise in this situation a legitimate piece of evidence in corroboration of the statements of the grammarians, against which moreover nothing positive has ever been adduced.

CARL D. BUCK.

Chicago, October, 1913.

NOTE ON STATIUS, *SILVAE*, I. vi. 75-80.

Inter quae subito cadunt volatu
immensae volucrum per astra nubes,
quas Nilus sacer horridusque Phasis,
quas udo Numidae legunt sub austro.
desunt qui rapiant, sinusque pleni
gaudent dum nova lucra comparantur.

PROFESSOR VERRALL, in his brilliant translation of this poem of Statius on the Saturnalia,² found a difficulty at this point. 'These birds, whatever they may have been to the ladies, are a very considerable surprise to us, and a puzzle too. The commentators are nowhere, so to speak. They tell us that these birds were only tickets, scattered among the crowd, each representing a specimen of game or poultry, and entitling the possessor, on application at some place indicated, to the actual bird. . . . Privately I guess them to have been some sort of toy-bird made of rag, tow, and what not, suspended above, lowered at the proper time near to the arena, and then allowed to flutter down.'

Remembering this essay, I was very much amused to read the following paragraph in the *New York World* of January 1, in its account of New York's Saturnalia—the festivities of New Year's Eve—which may or may not throw light upon Statius' birds:

² 'The Feast of Saturn' in *Collected Literary Essays*. Cambridge University Press, 1913.

'The lights went out a minute before twelve. Then, as the New Year began, from all parts of the hotel *flocks of white doves flew from hidden cages*. To the feet of each was attached a white ribbon. It was the game to grab a ribbon, haul down the dove, and pre-

sent it to the dearest—or nearest—woman.'

The New York doves seem to have been real ones, and perhaps the Roman birds were real too.

G. M. HIRST.

Columbia University, U.S.A.

REVIEWS

THE GREEK BUCOLIC POETS.

The Greek Bucolic Poets. With an English translation by J. M. EDMONDS. Loeb Classical Library, 1912.

It is very difficult to criticise this work, partly because it is in some ways very attractive, and partly because it contains so much that is novel. The writer is clearly enamoured of his subject and full of enthusiasm. There is a geniality and light-heartedness about the book which is very engaging; and, although extremely provocative in places, it is never dull. In quest of originality Mr. Edmonds has gone far, and one cannot but suspect that he delights to *épater les bourgeois*. If so, he must not be surprised if the plain man, after the original shock, pulls himself together and proceeds to hit back.

It will be convenient to consider separately, first, contributions to the interpretation of the poems; secondly, points of textual criticism; and thirdly, the style of translation.

(1) Mr. Edmonds in his Introductions to the *Idylls* makes some singular suggestions, some of which are founded upon theories which have occurred to predecessors, while others appear to be wholly his own. He is an adept at discovering 'veiled meanings.' Thus in *Id.* i. 106-7 the MSS. give:

ἔρπε ποτ' Ἀγχίσαν· τηρεῖ δρύες ὦδε
κύπειρος,
ὦδε καλὸν βομβεῦντι ποτὶ σμάνεσσι
μέλισσαι.

Mr. Edmonds renders:

*Begone to hind Anchises; sure bed-straw there
doth thrive,
And fine oak-trees and pretty bees all humming
at the hive.*

Here he follows Wilamowitz Moellendorf (whom for brevity I will call W. M.) in reading ἦδὲ . . . αἱ δὲ for ὦδε . . . ὦδε. W. M. has a very strange theory that the poet is referring to some legend that Anchises was blinded by bees, for boasting of his amour with Aphrodite.¹ Most persons will think that this cannot possibly be right, since Theocritus is a simple poet who does not write in enigmas. There is no hint in the Greek that the 'pretty bees' blinded Adonis. Mr. Edmonds pronounces W. M.'s solution to be 'excellent,' and proceeds to better it. Daphnis he says is the 'friend of all the wild creatures,' and his speech tells 'in veiled ironic terms what the vengeance of this friend of wild things will be; for Anchises was afterwards blinded by bees, Adonis slain by a boar, and Cypris herself wounded by Diomed.' Here the inclusion of Diomedes among the 'wild things' seems odd, but the chronology is still odder. Are we to place the scene of the *Idyll* not only before the Trojan war—to which some recent writers are prepared to give a date—but also before Adonis was killed by the boar? The difficulty becomes extreme in connexion with *Id.* viii.—a poem which, by the way, Mr. Edmonds considers not to be genuine—since he there identifies the lad Daphnis, who is as modern as any character in the *Idylls*, with the Daphnis of *Id.* i. His remark on viii. 93:

καὶ Νύμφαν ἄκρηβος ἐὼν ἔτι Ναῖδα
γάμεν

¹ The arguments which he advances will be found in his work *Die Textgeschichte der griechischen Bukoliker*, pp. 230-5.

is 'Naïs, apparently the nymph to whom Daphnis afterwards swore the oath which, when he fell in love with Xenea he died rather than break.'

In *Id.* vii. Legrand¹ has suggested that lines 78-9:

ἄσει δ' ὥς ποκ' ἔδεκτο τὸν ἀπόλον εὐρέα
 λάρναξ
 ζῶν ἔοντα κακῶσιν ἀτασθαλίαισιν ἀνακ-
 τος

were probably written before the execution of Sotades. This person, who is generally termed a writer of lascivious verses, but whom Mr. Edmonds terms a 'brave, outspoken poet,' was cast into prison for lampooning the King's mistress, and after escaping was subsequently drowned in a chest of lead. Mr. Edmonds suggests that 'after Sotades had been some years in prison Theocritus wrote the *Harvest Home*, hinting that Sotades had suffered long enough and sheltering himself under a reminder of his own early acquaintance with the King and a declaration of his allegiance to the great Court-poet Callimachus.' Such a theory will doubtless find acceptance among those who discover perpetual appeals on behalf of Murena in the *Odes* of Horace.

The suggestion is also made that the Amyntas of *Id.* vii. 2. is no other than Ptolemy himself, since the name is one which occurs in the royal family of Macedon. It is possible that Ptolemy might have been pleased by the description of himself in l. 132 as *χὼ καλὸς Ἀμύντιχος*,² 'pretty little Amyntas,' but hardly likely that he would have been flattered at being assigned so minor a part.

In *Idyll* xxvi. (*Ἀῆναι*) there is a strange line (29):

εἴη δ' ἐννεάτης ἢ καὶ δεκάτω ἐπιβαίνοι,

the sense of which is disputed. Cholmeley connects two facts—viz. (i) that in *Callimachus* iii. 14, the attendants of Artemis are to be Nymphs of nine years; and (ii) that children were sometimes initiated into the Bacchic mysteries, and proposes the bold interpretation 'let him be as a young novice of

Dionysus,' i.e. pure in heart. Mr. Edmonds improves on this by saying that the *Idyll* was probably written 'in honour of the initiation of a boy of nine into the mysteries of Dionysus by a mock slaying-rite. . . In this poem the father describes the slaying of Pentheus by his mother, and takes credit to himself for following her example.' This suggestion is truly prodigious.

Id. xxvii. (*ῥαριστὺς*) is generally supposed to be a dialogue between Daphnis and a *κόρη*, followed by an epilogue (in two lines) to a collection of bucolic poems. Mr. Edmonds states, without any expression of doubt, that the poem is mutilated, and that, when complete, it was 'a match between two shepherds, followed by the award of an umpire.' He assigns to the *κόρη* the name Acrotime, without mentioning that in l. 44 most editors read οἶδ', ἄκρα τιμὴ ἐσσί.

Space does not allow me to deal with other points, such as the theory that in *Id.* iv. Milon is a son of Lampriades (cf. l. 21), who has supplanted Battus in the affection of Amaryllis, a statement for which there is no warrant in ll. 35-37, and the substitution of *Μίλων* for *Ἀῖγων* in l. 34, coupled with the statement that the feats described in the context are by no means identical with those ascribed to the athlete of Croton by Athenaeus and Cicero.

Mr. Edmonds says of *Id.* viii. that 'metrical and linguistic considerations show the poem not to be the work of Theocritus.' The argument would be stronger, if he had not removed the chief metrical difficulty, viz. the hiatus before *ἀμνόν* in ll. 14 and 15, by reading *τῆρον* in both places. He thinks that *Id.* xvi. (*Χάριτες*) was 'an epistle dedicatory to a collection of poems, possibly xi. (*Κύκλωψ*) and xii. (*Ἀΐτης*).' We learn from Suidas that some ascribed to Theocritus poems termed *Ἑλπίδες*, and the guess has been made that xxi. (*Ἀλκίς*) may have belonged to this collection, on account of l. 66, *ἐλπίς τῶν ὕπνων*. Mr. Edmonds genially suggests that *Ids.* xiii. (*Ἰγλας*), xiv. (*Κύνισκα*), xv. (*Συρακόσιαι*), and xxiv. (*Ἡρακλίσκος*) should be referred to the *Ἑλπίδες*. He thinks that *Id.* ii. may have been included among the Lyric Poems, while he calls *Id.* i. a mime. All this is quite con-

¹ *Étude sur Théocrite*, p. 57.

² Calverley renders 'baby-faced Amyntas.'

trary to the usual classification of the *Idylls*.

(2) Mr. Edmonds has made more conjectures upon Theocritus than any editor since Ahrens. Most of them are already familiar to readers of the *Classical Review*.¹ Some of them are distinctly good. I should award the palm to xxix. 3 :

τὰ φρένων ἐρέω κέατ' ἐν μύχῳ,

where he neatly reads—

ἐρέω τὰ φρένων κέατ' ἐν μύχῳ,

correcting the strange order of the words.

Other good suggestions are xxv. 158 :

ἐν ὕλῃ χλωρᾷ ἰούσα (of a path) for

ἐν ὕλῃ χλωρᾷ ἐούση.

Epigram xxiv. 5 τίν for νιν in

τοσσόσδε γάρ νιν ἐξέβη μετρούμενος.

For γάρ νιν W. M. reads ἀριθμός, which is a violent conjecture. Among suggestions which, though not convincing, are ingenious, may be mentioned ii. 28, κῶρον for κηρὸν; xiii. 10, ἄροιο for ὄροιο; 12, ὄροισιν for ὄρφιν; 24, τόθι for τότε; xvi. 19, τί γένοιτο for τι γένοιτο.

Mr. Edmonds is fond of strange dialect forms. Thus in xi. 22 for φοιτῆς δ' αὐθ' οὕτως he gives φοιτῆς δαῦθ' οὕτως, introducing a word of doubtful form and meaning from fragments of Sappho and Alcaeus. In xxi. 45 πᾶσα κύων ἄρτον μαντεύεται, the reading of the MSS. presents some difficulty, since dogs do not like bread. Ahrens reads ἄρκτον, but a dog is not likely to dream of so rare and dangerous a quarry as a bear. Mr. Edmonds gives ἄρκον, a rare form for ἄρκτον. Needless to say, in xi. 73 he accepts W. M.'s αἶκ (=εἶ) for αἶκ' (=αἶκε). He also invents words with freedom, e.g. xxii. 77: αἶλ Βέβρυκες κομοῶντες. Here he refuses to take αἶλ with κομοῶντες, in spite of xvii. 107: πλοῦτος αἶλ κέχυται μογεόντων, and prints αἶλεἰ instead. This he says means 'thickly,' and he connects it with the Ionic word ἀλής (ā), cf. ἀολλής. His argument in favour of shortening the α- is very unconvincing.

Some emendations transcend the bounds of probability, e.g. xiv. 17 :

βολβός τις κοχλίας ἐξηρέθη.

Here he does not notice Wordsworth's beautiful correction κτεῖς for τις, and reads βολβοτίνα, κοχλίας. This appears to be a form for βολβίδιον = cuttle-fish, so named from its strong smell. This would not be so appetising a dainty as truffles.

xxiii. 4-5 :

κούκ ἤδει τὸν Ἐρωτα, τίς ἦν θεός, ἡλίκα τόξα

χερσὶ κρατεῖ, πῶς πικρὰ βέλη ποτὶ παιδία βάλλει.

For ποτὶ παιδία W. M. ingeniously reads ποτὶ καὶ Δία. Mr. Edmonds gives ποτὶ παίγνια, which he renders 'for his delectation,' i.e. Love shoots arrows just for fun!

In xx. 32-3 :

ἀλλ' ὅτι βουκόλος ἐμμί, παρέδραμε κού ποτακούει.

χῶ καλὸς Διόνυσος ἐν ἄγκεσι πόρτιν ἐλαύνει.

Here πόρτιν ἐλαύνει = 'drives heifers.' Mr. Edmonds substitutes ταῦρον for πόρτιν, and translates 'ride a bull,' illustrating from a vase-painting. Such a remark is very incongruous in the context.

Some singular interpretations are given, e.g. xxiii. 6-8 :

οὐδέ τι τῶν πυρσῶν παραμύθιον, οὐκ ἀμάρνγμα

χείλεος, οὐκ ὄσσων λιπαρὸν σέλας, οὐ ῥοδόμαλον,

οὐ λόγος, οὐχὶ φίλαμα, τὸ κουφίζει τὸν ἔρωτα.

Here Ahrens neatly reads ῥόδα μάλων, i.e. 'blush on the cheek.' Those editors who keep ῥοδόμαλον render 'rosy apple,' i.e. as a gift, but such gifts would more naturally come from the ἐραστής than from the boy. Mr. Edmonds explains ῥοδόμαλον as the apple or fruit of the wild rose, and says, 'Far from giving an apple (the usual love-gift), he would not even give him a "hip" from the hedgerow; these are edible, but make rather poor eating.'

Among such strained interpretations I

¹ *Classical Review*, 1911, pp. 37-39, 65-69; 1912, pp. 241-246; 1913, pp. 1-7, 73-78.

would mention those of ἐκρίθην ἄπο (viii. 74), ποτικρίνοιτο (ix. 6), αὐτῷ (xiii. 15)¹ ποθορώμενος (xxiii. 23), ὑπὲρ ἀνορέαν (xxix. 17), τὸν ὕμιοιον (ib. 19), τρίας (xxx. 13).

When Mr. Edmonds has made up his mind, he brushes aside all authority. Thus in xi. 58-59 he excludes the exquisitely naïve lines:

ἀλλὰ τὰ μὲν θέρεος, τὰ δὲ γίνεται ἐν
χειμῶνι,
ᾧστ' οὐκ ἂν τοι ταῦτα φέρειν ἅμα πάντ'
ἐδυνάθην,

saying, 'It is true that 58 is quoted and 59 paraphrased by Athenaeus, i. 5. A. But the interpolation may well have taken place before his time, for the lines are commented on in the Scholia.' The evidence of the Scholiast is here used against the lines instead of for them.

(3) Mr. Edmonds is original in the style of his translation, as elsewhere. Except in *Id.* xv. he employs an archaic style, sometimes explaining an unfamiliar word. This archaic style is found both in the verse which he uses for the songs and in his prose. His verse is generally 'the common ballad-metre written long, with seven, or when there is a medial pause, six, strokes to the line.' The following specimens of his verse and prose will be read with pleasure, even by those who are not acquainted with the original.

xi. 19-29:

O Galatea, fair and white, white as curds in whey,
Dapper as lamb a-frisking, wanton as calf at play,
And plump o' shape as ruddying grape, O why deny thy lover?
O soon enow thou'rt here, I trow, when sweet sleep comes me over,
But up and gone when sleeping's done—O never flees so fast
Ewe that doth spy gray wolf anigh as thou when slumber's past.
My love of thee began, sweeting, when thou—I mind it well—
Wast come a-pulling luces wi' my mother on the fell;
I showed ye where to look for them, and from that hour to this
I've loved ye true, but Lord! to you my love as nothing is.

¹ Mr. Edmonds quotes the scholiast for his interpretation, viz. αὐτόθεν, i.e. 'straightway.' This, however, is not the scholiast to *K*, who is generally referred to, but an inferior scholiast.

xxx. 24-32:

'Such lesson and more read I unto my soul, and thus she answered me again: "Whoso thinketh to outvie yon cozening Love, as soon might he think to tell how-many-times-nine stars be i' th' skies above us; and so I too, willy-nilly, must fain stretch my neck beneath the yoke and pull, seeing such, my lord, is the will of a God that hath betrayed ev'n the mickle mind of Zeus, and beguiled ev'n the Cyprus-born, and catcheth up and carrieth whithersoever he list (as well he may) a poor mortal leaf like me that needs but a puff of air to lift it.'

It may be remarked that this poem (also xxix.) is successfully rendered into Elizabethan verse in *Classical Review*, 1911, p. 69 (cf. p. 39).

The archaic style lends itself to certain mannerisms. Mr. Edmonds is full of allusive periphrases, especially in the case of deities. I quote the following renderings: i. 138 Ἀφροδίτα, 'the Love-Ladye' (so x. 33); ii. 7 ὅ τ' Ἐρως . . . ἄ τ' Ἀφροδίτα, 'Love and the Lady'; ib. 148 Ἀὼ τὰν ῥοδόπαχυν, 'She o' the Rose-red Arm'; xviii. 36 Ἀρτεμιν . . . καὶ εὐρύστερνον Ἀθάναν, 'the Gods of Women above' (where εὐρύστερνον is missed)²; xxviii. 7 χαρίτων ἡμεροφώνων, 'Ladies o' the Voice of Delight.' We may compare i. 45 ἀλιτρύτοιο γέροντος, 'master Weatherbeat'; x. 7 ὄψαμάτα, 'Good master early-and-late-wi'-sickle'; xxviii. 13 Θευγένιδος . . . εὐσφύρου 'Mistress Pretty-toes.'

The reader will become somewhat weary of the word *piece*. Thus in *Id.* xx we have l. 21 ἀδύ τι κάλλος, 'a sweet piece of beauty'; 31 τὰ δ' ἀστικά, 'your city pieces'; 43 ἡ Κυβέλας κρέσσων, 'this piece that is a greater than Cybele.'

The echo, or rhyme, which Mr. Edmonds allows himself from time to time in his ballad measure, sometimes produces an unpleasing jingle, e.g.—

vii. 127:

ἄτις ἐπιφθύζουσα τὰ μὴ καλὰ νόσφιν
ἐρύκοι.

To sit for us and spit for us and bid all ill go by.

² Other omissions which I have noted are iv. 8 καὶ κάρτος, xv. 45 ἀνάρημοι καὶ ἄμετροι, ib. 134 καὶ ἐπὶ σφυρὰ κόλπον ἀνέσαι

xv. 140:

οὐθ' οἱ ἔτι πρότερον Λαπίθαι καὶ Δευ-
καλίωνες.

Nor none o' the kith o' the old Lapith nor of
them of Deucalion's kin.

I must now give some specimens
which the English reader will think
very odd, and with reason.

iv. 32-37:

O Croton is a bonny town as Zacynth by the
sea,

And a bonny sight on her eastward height is the
fane of Laciny,

Where boxer Milon one fine morn made four-
score loaves his meal.

And down the hill another day,
While lasses holla'd by the way,
To Amaryllis, laughing gay,
Led the bull by the heel.

Laciny (for Λακίνιον) is not nice,
but Mr. Edmonds has several similar
forms. I must, however, protest against
'Zopy' as a rendering of Ζωπυρίον in
xv. 13, although there the language is
colloquial.

viii. 49-52:

Buck-goat, husband of the she's,
Hie to th' woods' infinities—
Nay, snubbies, hither to the spring:
This errand's not for your running.
Go, buck, and 'Fairest Milon' say,
A god kept seals once on a day.

ib. 72-75:

Yestermorn a long-browed maid,
Spying from a rocky shade
Neat and neatherd passing by,
Cries, 'What a pretty boy am I!'
Did pretty boy the jape repay?
Nay, bent his head and went his way.

To these must be added v. 132-3:

οὐκ ἔραμ' Ἀλκίππας, ὅτι με πρᾶν οὐκ
ἐφίλησε
τῶν ὥτων καθελοῖς, ὅκα οἱ τὰν φάσσαν
ἔδωκα,

which is rendered—

When I brought the cushat 'tother night, 'tis
true Alcippa kissed me;
But alack! she forgot to kiss by the pot, and
since, poor wench, she's missed me.

'To kiss by the pot' is scarcely equi-
valent to the Greek χύτρα or 'jug-kiss,'
in which the operator took the patient
by the ears.

Readers of the Loeb series it is to be
presumed are largely babes in scholar-
ship. They will not, however, find
themselves put on a milk diet in this
volume. It is to be hoped that they will
be able to digest the stimulating food
with which they are provided.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

HISTOIRE DE L'ART DANS L'ANTIQUITÉ.

Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité. Par
GEORGES PERROT et CHARLES
CHAPIEZ. Tome X. La céramique
d'Athènes. Pp. 818. 25 plates;
436 cuts. Paris: Hachette and Co.,
1914.

IN spite of the loss of his colleague
M. Chipiez, M. Perrot, a gallant and
unwearing veteran, persists in his great
work, and carries it on at the same high
level. The new volume of the great
history of ancient art takes up the vases
of Euboea, Boeotia, and Attica, and
carries on their history to the middle
of the fifth century.

It must be confessed that M. Perrot
has no light task. A Frenchman and
an Academician, he has an instinctive
dislike to loose and rugged ways of

procedure. He has to produce a con-
secutive text, which will read as a work
of literature. No detailed descriptions
in small type; no mass of learned notes
taking half the page; every paragraph
must be neatly rounded and carefully
fitted into its place. But M. Perrot's
love of balance of rhythm and of order,
though sometimes it seems scarcely
appropriate in so rough a field, is
essentially Greek, and goes well with
the author's appreciation of his subject-
matter.

Nor does it by any means exclude
accuracy in detail. Many times, in
reading the work, the reviewer has
come upon what seemed to be slips;
but almost always, on closer examina-
tion, they have turned out to be at most
trifling. It has no doubt been an

immense advantage to M. Perrot that he has been able constantly to consult M. Pottier, one of the best living judges of Greek vases: and it is pleasant to see that he is always ready to give weight to the most recent views of the youngest of researchers in his field.

M. Perrot ranges himself on the side of those who trace the origin of the outburst of Greek vase-painting, not to a Mycenaean survival, but to the workshops and looms of Asia and Egypt. On this point his opinion has great importance, since no one has a wider knowledge of the art conditions of the eighth and seventh centuries. Attic vase-painting in particular he regards as based mainly on Ionian models, with some cross-influence from Corinth. The earliest Attic vases which were exported were the so-called Corintho-Attic: and M. Perrot thinks that they were sent out not empty, but full of oil. There is much authority in favour of this view; but the practical difficulties in the way of its acceptance are enormous. How could vessels so frail and so heavily weighted be carried in little ships across the stormy seas to Italy and Cyrene? M. Perrot also thinks that the cups of Hiero and Duris were used in the drinking bouts of the Athenian youths, when they would have even less chance of survival than at a modern undergraduates' supper. It seems obvious that metal cups would be more suitable.

In successive sections M. Perrot gives a lucid account of the classes of vases, selecting for his illustrations some of the most noteworthy examples. The early vases of Ionia and of Corinth he had already considered in Vol. IX. He proceeds to the vases of Euboea, all of which he would assign to Eretria, the curious Boeotian wares, and the vases of Athens, primitive, black-figured, red-figured, and white-ground, ending with the egg-shell cups of Sotades and the unguent-vases in the shape of the human head. The sepulchral lekythi he postpones as too late in date for the present volume.

There are, of course, minor blemishes in the book. There are many misprints in numbers and references, and occasional oversights, as when a vase-

scene figures twice over (at pages 115 and 119) once as a battle between Herakles and Amazons, and once (more correctly) as a battle between Herakles and Amazons mixed with Scythian archers. But such oversights are few in comparison with the very rich and varied contents of the book.

The engravings are sufficiently numerous to illustrate most points in the history of vase-painting, and though, of course, the cuts lose much in the way of style, they are as good as one could expect. It might be wished that vases were not represented in two ways, sometimes in outline drawing and sometimes in silhouette; but unfortunately both ways of representation, of which the second is by far the best, are usual in our catalogues and journals; and it is not easy to translate the representation of a vase from one style to the other.

A strict adherence to academic form may cause difficulty in treating of the technique of vases and the peculiarities of individual examples. But it is no drawback in the more systematic and theoretic dissertations in which the volume is rich. It would be difficult to find a more satisfactory account of the way in which the red-figured method of vase-painting superseded the black-figured method than that contained in pages 270-280; and Chapter xxx. especially, which deals with the history of design on vases, and the relation of the vase-painter's art to that of the great fresco-painters, is full of sound and luminous remarks. Drawing upon two papers by Pottier and Berchmans, M. Perrot has set forth the way in which the study of shadows or silhouettes thrown by the sun on walls aided the formation of the black-figured style. He shows how the figures on vases are not mere attempts to transcribe the visible, but are mental constructions based alike upon observation and memory impression. These demonstrations supplement and confirm those of Professor Löwy in regard to the earliest Greek art: I regret that in my recent *Principles of Greek Art* I did not draw upon them more. Excellent also is M. Perrot's account of the intrusion of everyday subjects and expressive

naturalism into those vases of Euphronius and Duris which represent the dissolute life of the young Athenians of their day: however noble and ideal Greek art of the fifth century may have been, it was anything but Puritan.

In the matter of the relation of vase-painting to the great historic paintings of the stoae and galleries of Greece, M. Perrot pursues a middle course. He thinks that we find on vases, as in sculpture, what may be called 'elegant extracts' from great classic works; but he does not overlook the essential originality of the Greek artist, which made any sort of exact or mechanical copying almost an impossibility to him. 'Tout concourt ainsi à nous représenter ces collaborateurs du potier comme des artistes d'allures très indépendantes. Préparés par des traditions de famille à l'office qu'ils auraient à remplir, ils s'exerçaient, dès l'enfance, comme apprentis, au dessin à main levée; puis, quand la pratique leur en était devenue familière, appelés à fournir aux besoins d'une production très active, ils écoutaient toutes les suggestions, ils pre-

naient leur bien partout où ils le trouvaient.'

Amid the multitude of specialist works which treat of the technique and peculiarities of various classes of Greek vases in ever greater detail, and with ever narrower outlook, it is refreshing to come across a book which, like M. Perrot's, never loses the wood in the trees, but has always in view the bearing of the facts of ancient vase-painting on our knowledge of ancient culture, habits, and art. He writes not as a specialist nor as a collector, but as one who realises that Greek painting must be taken into account as an important factor in the development of the Hellenic spirit, and, indeed, in the rise of the civilisation of Europe. Hence such historic questions as the debt of Athens to Solon for promoting her close connection with Delphi, and to the Pisistratidae for importing into Europe the artists of Ionia, naturally come up for discussion, and receive valuable illustration.

P. GARDNER.

THE PRINCETON EXPEDITIONS TO SYRIA.

Ancient Architecture in Syria. By H. C. BUTLER (Division II). *Greek and Latin Inscriptions in Syria.* By E. LITTMANN, D. MAGIE and D. R. STUART (Division III). Section A: *Southern Syria: Part III.* Umm idj-Djimâl. Leyden: E. T. Brill. 1913.

THESE two parts follow the same plan as their predecessors, and are done with the same care and thoroughness. The architectural part is illustrated by plans, elevations, restorations, drawings of detail, photographs, and a large map giving all the districts that were excavated; the inscriptions are given in facsimile and transliterated, the Greek inscriptions also translated.

If the buildings here described do not show finer workmanship or greater skill than in some other parts of Syria, they are at least both good and interesting. Some of the masonry is stated to be of fine workmanship, and the photographs

bear this out. The houses, which appear to belong partly to each of the first seven centuries, are usually built round a courtyard, several in a block it would appear, the outside of the block being bare and uninviting, the life of the community within. Several storeys often remain more or less preserved. One remarkable point is a mode of planning which seems new. In several blocks the houses are built so that the whole height is occupied by two large vaulted chambers, one above the other, while at one side of these another series of chambers is in four storeys, sometimes on the other side a third series of three storeys; all these are under one roof, the height of the two large rooms together being equal to the height of the series of three or four beside them. It is difficult to describe this, and the sentence which the author uses to do so on page 194 is obscure; it gives the impression that houses of

six storeys were common, but a glance at the pictures shows what is meant. It is quite clear that the architects knew exactly what they wanted, and got it with the minimum of space. Outside staircases are common here as elsewhere.

There is a great variety of churches here; one is a double church, and of this one part is remarkable because it shows wide arches on slender pillars; elsewhere the architects seem to have feared to put too much weight on pillars, and if arches are used they are small. The explorer has named some of his churches after the persons named in their inscriptions; it is puzzling at first, and the reader thinks he has found a new saint in Julianos or Claudianos.

The structure of the tombs is remarkable, and they are well preserved. Here they are not cut in the rock, but a pit is dug in the ground or a hole in the hillside, and the space floored, roofed, and walled with stone; out of this loculi are built projecting endwise, as in a columbarium, but shaped to hold a whole body at length.

The inscriptions present nothing to startle, but there are some novelties. Θεὸς Σολμὸς appears for the first time in a Greek inscription (No. 239), Ζεὺς is "Ἄγιος in 241; in 244 μάστερ appears to represent *magister* (in modern Greek they still say ὁ μάστορας or the like). The cross, a symbol of victory in 251 (+ τουτω νικα και βοηθι) actually appears before a faction cry in 256 + νικα ε τιχη του βενετου, not the only relic of the famous Blue Faction. This stands over a church door; so religion and politics were combined in Syria long ago, and there is one other thing not new under the sun. Many Semitic names occur in Greek forms, several for the first time; one hitherto doubtful, Παουας, is, I am glad to see, now definitely established (No. 276). For the mysterious abbreviation ββ (284) a new explanation is suggested, with reasons, βουλευτῆς βοστηνῶν. There is one attempt at a metrical epitaph (262), but the author has no staying power; two lines almost scan, then the poor fellow falls off sadly.

W. H. D. ROUSE.

ATHENS AND ITS MONUMENTS.

Athens and its Monuments. By C. H. WELLER. 8vo. 260 illustrations. Pp. xxiv + 412. New York: the Macmillan Company, 1913.

THE topography of Athens is and seems likely to remain a subject full of controversies; and anyone who ventures to write about them must steer cautiously between the Scylla of an unjustified dogmatism and the Charybdis of wearisome arguments. Yet it is difficult, if not impossible, to give an intelligible account of Athens and its extant monuments without some account of these controversial matters, and therefore the author of such a book as the present must be judged to a great extent by his success in keeping what he himself calls 'a straight course between doubt and dogmatism'; and it is difficult to avoid his conclusion that doubt is often the more reasonable of the two. Professor Weller is evidently familiar with the

literature of the subject, and is well informed as to all the most recent results of discovery and investigation. But it is by no means an easy task to bring this knowledge within the compass of such a volume as the present; for although the numerous illustrations are a valuable addition to the work, and make it far easier to understand and to follow, they cannot but curtail the already limited space available for the text.

After some introductory chapters of a more general and historical character, the author has chosen to follow in the main the description of Pausanias, as being convenient and logical. Unfortunately, however, the route of Pausanias itself is not free from disputes. The well-known 'Enneakrounos episode' at once offers a crucial example. Here Professor Weller finds it convenient to describe what he calls 'the Ancient Agora'—that is to say, the various buildings and precincts discovered by

Dörpfeld in the neighbourhood of his Enneakrounos—in a digression from his description of the Ceramicus. On the other hand, he reserves the description of the 'Enneakrounos' itself for its place in the text of Pausanias, interpolated as it is in the middle of the enumeration of buildings in the Agora. It would be impossible to find a better proof that the order of description in Pausanias, even on Dörpfeld's interpretation, is not so 'convenient and logical' as is claimed, or a better illustration of the fact that the topographical order sometimes has to give way to an arrangement by subject in a descriptive work such as this. As to the general topographical problem, especially in relation to the famous passage in Thucydides about the early city, it is to be noted that the compromise seems to be gaining ground which recognises the Pythium and Olympieum as the familiar shrines near the Ilissus, but accepts Dörpfeld's identification of the Dionysium in the Marshes and Enneakrounos; Professor Weller adds a sketch plan, which brings out very clearly the topographical probability of this

scheme. His method of dealing with the Dionysium is characteristic; he mentions the identification as resting on an 'extended course of reasoning which cannot be outlined here,' and then refers to the recent suggestion that it is the Heracleum in Melite, adding that 'the hypothesis carries too much else with it to be acceptable at present.' This statement of the case is reasonable, but it is not very satisfying; it offers a good example of the difficulty of treating a complicated and controversial subject in a brief and impartial manner.

It would be easy to prolong criticism of this sort to an almost unlimited extent, but perhaps enough has been given to show the author's methods; had he had more space at his disposal, he would probably have anticipated most of what could be said about his work. His apology for the absence of references is fully justified, so far as concerns what can be found in Judeich; but it would have been a help if he had given some more references to the most recent of scattered articles.

E. A. GARDNER.

STUDI GRACCANI.

Studi Graccani. By G. CARDINALI.
Pp. iv+212. Genoa: Oliveri, 1912.
L. 8.

THIS book is taken up with a series of minute investigations on leading problems of the history of the Gracchi. Its first and longest chapter discusses the sources of information for the Gracchan period. On the basis of an exhaustive study of parallel passages Prof. Cardinali corroborates the conclusions established by German *Quellenforschung*, that the great majority of Latin writers have one ultimate authority in common, which is also shared by Plutarch, and that Plutarch and Appian draw upon another common source. On the other hand he refuses his assent to a theory now in vogue among German scholars, that the Latin writers used none but the one common source, and he postulates at least three primary Latin sources. In support of

this view he argues that the age of the Gracchi was rich in contemporary records which must have reflected the sharp division of opinion on political questions then prevailing. He also points to the marked divergence between the mass of the Latin writers and Livy, which he declines to explain, with Ed. Meyer, as the result of Livy's independent reflexion; and he emphasises the fact that Cicero was caught between several minds in passing judgment on the Gracchi. The force of all these arguments cannot be denied. Of contemporary Roman authors no less than five are known to us by name, and it would be strange if all of these save one had been blankly ignored by later writers. A divergence in Livy may safely be ascribed to a divergence in his source: his mechanical methods preclude the idea that he deliberately reversed the verdict of a *consensus auctorum*. Lastly, as Cardinali cogently remarks,

the inconsistencies of Cicero show that in and before his day tradition concerning the Gracchi was by no means uniform. Nor do these reasonings exhaust the case against a unity of sources. The points of contact between the various Latin authors will be found to relate mostly to salient incidents in the lives of the chief *dramatis personae*—i.e., just the sort of events which one might expect several independent witnesses to describe in similar terms. In order to obtain a crucial test of a common derivation for the Latin writers it would be necessary either to discover affinities of thought in their treatment of really debatable matter—e.g., the agrarian law, or to detect a recurrence of the same verbal expressions among them. But the contentious subjects in the story of the Gracchi are precisely those on which the Roman writers are most reticent, and as to verbal resemblances, these do not appear to be systematic except in the case of Cicero and Velleius Paterculus. Another point worth noting is that the source from which Plutarch and Appian drew in common was avowedly of early date and very high authority. It is therefore unlikely that none of the Latin writers should have made any use of it in addition to their common informant. To sum up, however attractive the 'unitarian' theory of sources may be, we must agree with Cardinali that it remains unproved and improbable.

The second chapter passes in review the pre-Gracchan measures of land reform, with special reference to the Lex Licinia, which limited the holdings of *ager occupatorius* to 500 jugera. In opposition to Niese and his many followers, who assign this law to the second century, Cardinali would locate it at or near 367 B.C., its traditional date. Some of the points which he makes against Niese are decidedly strong—e.g., his quotation from Livy X. 10, 13-14, which records the application in 298 B.C. of a law similar to if not identical with the Lex Licinia. There is also much force in his argument that over and above the public land absorbed during the early part of the fourth century in colonization and *virgane* settlement there must have remained

a considerable territory available for 'possessores.' Indeed, the natural result of the wars in which the *ager publicus* was acquired would be to render large tracts unfit for distribution to small owners, who would lack the capital for its regeneration. Under such conditions the accumulation of land by 'possessio' may well have occurred even in the fourth century. But Cardinali is less fortunate in meeting the assertion that the 'lex de modo agrorum' as described by Plutarch and Appian is more appropriate to the conditions of the second than to those of the fourth century. To say that this modern colouring of the law is due to mere distortion on the part of the Greek authors is a weak expedient. A more probable solution of the difficulty is that the fourth-century law was re-drafted and re-enacted to suit later conditions (the fixing of the maximum holding at 500 jugera may well belong to this re-draft), and that the Gracchan land law revived this rather than the original Lex Licinia. It is also regrettable that Cardinali takes no account of Soltau's interesting theory (*Neue Jahrb.*, 1910, p. 711 sqq.) that the early possessores used the hired labour of adjacent small owners, rather than servile labour, and that the Lex Licinia belongs to the age of the Great Latin War.

In chapter iii. the chief point of interest is Cardinali's denial of the common statement that the Gracchan land law contemplated assignments to non-Romans. His contention is supported by one strong, not to say decisive argument, the absence of all reference to non-Roman assignees in the agrarian law of 111 B.C.

In chapter iv. Cardinali discusses the subsequent history of the Gracchan land campaign. He assigns the Lex Thoria, with good reason, to 111 B.C. He follows a widely accepted but not unassailable view in dating the second of the post-Gracchan land laws at 118 B.C., and in refusing to believe that the census figures of 131 and 125 B.C. prove a great increase in the number of Roman freeholders.¹ On the other

¹ A detailed criticism of these theories by the present reviewer will be found in *Klio*, 1913, pp. 196-8.

hand he takes a line of his own in suggesting that the chief purpose of the extant agrarian statute of 111 B.C. was to check the renewed seizure of lands by 'possessio.' Now it is true that line 4 of the statute can fairly be interpreted as a veto on future 'possessio,' and line 25 even prescribes penalties for such encroachment. But it must be remembered that in 111 B.C. the amount of public land which was not already occupied effectively and by a good title cannot have been at all extensive. Indeed, it is difficult to understand what categories of land were still liable to usurpation, except the 'common waste' mentioned in line 25, and, possibly, some portions of the 'ager compascuus' (line 14) whose tenants had not defended their rights. And this

is as much as saying that the main purpose of the statute must have been quite different from what Cardinali supposes.

It is but natural that on topics so controversial as those which the present volume discusses it should not always be possible to see eye to eye with the author. But his judgment on the whole is sane and trustworthy, and the fulness and frankness with which he sets forth the ancient authorities and modern comment on them, always enables the reader to draw conclusions of his own. Prof. Cardinali can hardly claim to have disposed of all the questions which he raises, but he has certainly advanced the discussion on many of them.

M. O. B. CASPARI.

QUAESTIONES AENEANAE.

Quaestiones Aeneanae. Pars I. scripsit HERBERT FISCHER, Dr. Phil. Pp. 67. Dresdae: ex officina Teubneriana, MCMXIV.

THE little fragment of human experience which bears the naive title 'How to resist when your city is besieged,' has hitherto been unjustly neglected in England, but it has from time to time of recent years served as a parade ground for the complicated evolutions of certain German scholars, who march and countermarch an interminable array of arguments without leaving on the reader's mind anything more than a despairing sense of distorted ingenuity. Time was when Casaubon, in the 'praefatio' to his invaluable *editio princeps* (1609), did not hesitate to assert his belief that Aeneas 'Tacticus,' and Aeneas of Stymphalus, who commanded the forces of the Arcadian League in 367 B.C. (*cf.* Xen. *Hell.* vii. 3. 1.), were one and the same person; but since then the personality of the author has been wilfully shrouded in mystery as deep as that of Homer's; and the most recent edition of his book (R. Schoene, Teubner, 1911, Intr. p. xii.) leaves him as we still leave the *Iliad's* author, 'incertae aetatis ignotaeque nobis patriae scriptor militaris.' Indeed (to complete the parallel) since the appear-

ance of two baleful Dioscuri on his horizon in the seventies, 'Aeneas-Kritik' has steered a course no less portentous than 'Homer-Kritik.'¹ Where Hug had slain his thousands and Hercher his ten thousands, others were quick to follow; 'inorganic' sentences received short shrift; whole paragraphs and even chapters were condemned without trial, and sentenced either to death at the obelus or indiscriminate transportation; diction and syntax reformed altogether on an 'Attic' theory which, in its ruthless audacity, would have done credit to a Fick; and it is only during the last few years that editors and commentators have returned to humaner counsels and been content to take Aeneas as they found him. The fact is that this book in its unregenerate state presents us with a unique chapter in the early history of the *κωμῆ*; but that is another story.

The latest product of 'Aeneas-Kritik' is on the whole reassuring to the convinced 'unitarian.' True, Herr Fischer digs deep for his 'Proto-Aeneas,' and no less than twelve superincumbent 'strata' (see table on p. 64) rest on his original Ilium, but it is a relief to find

¹ *Aeneae Commentarius Poliorceticus*, ex rec. Rudolphus Hercher. Berolini, 1870. *Aen. Comm. Pol.* rec. Arnoldus Hug. Lipsiae, 1874

that the whole superstructure is the work of none other but Aeneas himself; and that Aeneas is after all a fourth century writer; and (we suspect, though he nowhere as yet asserts it), the same Aeneas as Xenophon's man. Yet even Herr Fischer at times succumbs to the fatal fascinations of an occasional 'interpolator' (e.g., in C. XVIII. 22 and XIX.), and a 'later recension' which attempted indiscreetly to render first aid to a gaping and mutilated text (pp. 16, 17, on C. III. 6. and X. 19.). His method has been by a careful and at times tedious examination to demonstrate the faulty arrangement and apparent inconsequence esp. of the first part of the treatise (C. I.-XXI.), and to apply the results of this examination to the problem of how the treatise grew into its present shape.

This is no place to discuss an infinity of detail. But we are left with a general impression that the labour performed has been serviceable, if not indispensable, to the better exploration of a not uninteresting byway in Greek literature—viz., the evolution of the Technical Treatise. Aeneas was, 'after Homer,' as Aelian reminds us in the preface to his *Tactics*, the first writer on the Art of War; and it would be unreasonable to expect from a rough condottiere (I beg that question) a close conformity to our own ideas of composition and arrangement. On the whole we feel that Herr Fischer's laborious proofs follow the dictates of common sense, though the results to which they conduct us are sometimes not very different to those we might have reached by unaided intuition. He is wholly right in condemning the insane juggling with the order of the treatise which delighted the heart of some previous commentators, and takes particular account of the way in which Aeneas is liable to be switched off, so to say, to a wholly new topic, at a moment's notice, by a single word or detail of some historical illustration (pp. 37, 43: he sums up 'Invenimus id quod summi est momenti dispositionem cap. I.-XX. quaerentibus; habemus enim fere nullam, sed sicut navis

fertur fluminis undis, sic auctor fertur materie'): so (and he makes much of this) his 'exempla' are often 'incipitia'—i.e., while adduced to illustrate some foregoing precept, they form a bridge over which the reader is led on to a newly suggested subject. Further, he aptly reminds us of the way in which we should *a priori* expect a treatise of this kind to be composed and published; composed by a process of continual revision and addition in the light of the author's growing experience, and published primarily within a small circle of professional friends (see note 2 on p. 47).

All this is sound and worth saying; but when the writer comes to constructive detail, I feel that he treads much less certain ground. He gives us one really enticing interpretation (based on von Gutschmid, *Kl. Schr.* IV. p. 219), namely, that of the *Διονύσιος* and *Ἡρακλείδας* passage in C. XXXI. 31; but his rare attempts to deal with textual difficulties are not at all convincing; his confident demarcation of the various 'strata' in C. I.-XXI. seems to me very arbitrary with one exception (the 'second person' passages in CC. IX. and XVI.), and supported by no sufficient evidence; while his table of dates corresponding to the 'strata' on p. 68, though interesting, is to the casual reader really very misleading. Finally, I must at present express a provisional disagreement with his startling proposition in the Appendix (p. 66): 'Primum denegamus compositum esse libellum eo animo ut utilitatem ferret iis, qui profecto obsidentur,' and his opinion (unless I misunderstand him) that the treatise was used as a series of lectures on *Tactics* (*Schulvorträge*) to students for a military diploma (or was it as a school reading book?). But it would be unfair to prejudge this question pending the appearance of Part II. of *Quaestiones Aeneanae*, to which I look forward with interest, if not with great impatience.

L. W. HUNTER.

New College, Oxford.

THE MUNICIPALITIES OF THE ROMAN EMPIRE.

The Municipalities of the Roman Empire.

By J. S. REID. 1 vol. 8vo. xv+548. Cambridge University Press.

PROFESSOR REID deals with many subjects interesting and important to students—far more indeed than his title promises. Beginning with the pre-historic Italian town, the organisation of Republican Italy, and the arrangements of Caesar and Augustus (pp. 1-192), he passes on to the details of municipal life of the various provinces under the Empire (pp. 193-435), and devotes three final chapters (pp. 436-522) to internal administration, the process of decay, and what he calls 'social aspects.' No one in a brief review could satisfactorily appraise a work of this wide range. Some things are obvious—that it is as learned as it is comprehensive; that many sections of it break new ground, and many views expressed in it deserve most careful weighing; and that, on the other hand, its value is most seriously reduced, both for learners and for advanced scholars, by the total exclusion of references, footnotes, and excursus, though many statements in it are exactly of the kind which really need such equipment. Let me give just one example. On p. 312, dealing with Roman Africa, Professor Reid observes that "princeps peregrinorum," found in several places, seems to be an equivalent of "princeps gentis." Now most people would connect the title 'princeps peregrinorum' with the well-known officer at Rome, the 'Chef des politischen Detectivecorps,' as he has been called, who occurs actually on several African inscriptions. Obviously Professor Reid cannot mean him. But the student needs a warning that he does not, and even advanced scholars might wish to know what he really does refer to. But all this will be, or has been, said by many reviewers. I shall perhaps do best to confine myself to some parts of the Western Empire in which I am interested.

The author discusses Gaul in chapter VII., and Britain in chapter IX.

In both cases he is, I think, somewhat pessimistic. In chapter VII. he seems to me to underrate both the town-life and the Romanisation of *Tres Galliae*. There were, as everybody knows, next to no 'coloniae' or 'municipia' in them. But there were many large and Romanised towns. Consider, for one thing, the archaeological remains—to which Dr. Reid seldom alludes. Of course, good building-stone is generally rarer here, and the climate is less kindly to masonry, than in the golden land of Provence, and succeeding ages, both in war and peace, have dealt most unkindly. But quite enough survives; the stones of Sens alone should have sufficed to dispel his melancholy. The inscriptions, too, reveal a constant tendency to convert Gaulish communal capitals into towns of Roman style and to implant Roman titles of magistrates.

Professor Reid brings various arguments to support his point of view. But I am not sure if they all hold good. Is it true that 'a deep-seated instinct' rendered Gauls (as distinct from Germans) averse to town-life? The Celt probably, as Meitzen has taught us, cared little for villages; but he took readily enough to towns. Is it true that Trier was ever a full '*colonia civium Romanorum*'? Its *vicus Seniae* and other features do not suggest it. Is it true that distances in Gaul were 'always' reckoned by the 'leuga' and not by the Roman mile? And so far as they were counted by leagues, is that a proof of imperfect Romanisation? To me it shews, like the *Hercules Deusonienensis* and *Magusanus* of third-century coins, that Gaulish traditions could combine and be absorbed in Roman civilisation. It is a proof, not that Gaul remained un-Romanised, but that Roman and Gaul came together in a most real way.

Professor Reid is even more pessimistic about Britain. He not only points out that the towns of Roman Britain were rather few and rather small. He adds to this quite correct view a curious scepticism about evidence.

It is hard, in the absence of footnotes, to discuss his details, but I cannot help thinking his scepticism too great. He says of Gloucester that 'no evidence of colonial status has been found in the place itself,' and he goes on to describe the evidence as so scanty as 'to have been nearly swept away by time.' But the municipality of Glevum is attested by an inscription at Bath and another at Rome, by an ancient writer, and by one of the most remarkable groups of municipal tiles, found partly in and partly near Gloucester, which any Roman town can boast. He says again, of Lindum (Lincoln) that it was 'not of the usual structure,' and that a native town had preceded it. But the 'colonia' at Lincoln seems to be planted in the Flavian period, in succession to a legionary fortress; and all that is known of its streets and buildings is normal and characteristically Roman. Of York he says that no citizen of higher dignity than a 'sevir Augustalis' can be traced here, and he omits a decurion; he ignores, too, the bishop who went to the Council of Arles. Again, he will have none of an argument by which, through comparison of Ravennas with actual remains, I have tried to construct a rough list of Romano-British cantonal capitals, but he gives no indication why it is rejected: merely, 'we are left without proof.' Nor does he care about the clues which the remains of Silchester and Caerwent afford to the character of these towns. He doubts if they spoke Latin at Caerwent, despite the scribbles on their

plaster. He finds the public buildings of Silchester somewhat mean, despite the size of the basilica and the height of its columns.

I cannot help thinking (I may, of course, be hopelessly prejudiced) that Roman Britain deserved somewhat more attention. After all, we know more about the towns of Britain than about those of any other Roman province. No place has been excavated so thoroughly as Silchester. It is in Britain that we learn what the municipal life of the Empire really came to, just as in the small town of Pompeii we learn what we cannot discover in scores of larger Italian cities. I hasten to add that, so far as I can judge, my interests in the Roman Empire have led me to review in detail just those parts of the world which attract Professor Reid least. He describes Roman Africa far more amply and far more penetratingly than he does the regions of the Danube or the Rhine or the Atlantic. Even better are his chapters on the theory and history of the Roman municipality in the abstract. These form the beginning and the end of his volume and might well be studied together, as one whole. I think they will be recognised as both important contributions to knowledge and useful aids to English learners. They suffer, of course, from the lack of footnotes and references; they do not, however, suffer so much from the absence of maps, plans, and illustrations, which are hardly required in them.

F. HAVERFIELD.

HOLMES' CAESAR DE BELLO GALLICO.

C. Iuli Caesaris Commentarii Rerum in Gallia Gestarum VII. A. Hirti Commentarius VIII. Edited by T. RICE HOLMES. 8vo. Pp. lxvi + 462. 13 maps and plans and 7 illustrations in the text. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 8s. 6d. net.

DR. RICE HOLMES continues to shower benefits on all students of Caesar's *Gallie War*. It is now fortunately unnecessary, and may even be regarded as impertinent

to praise the varied merits of his work: it is only needful to record the particular treasures from his well-filled store set before us in his latest volume. The most novel is a critical commentary on the text of the *Gallie War* unequalled in the English language for thoroughness. Yet I think that Dr. Holmes, while retaining his independence of judgment, has too often followed the great German critics in rejecting words, phrases, and even whole chapters as

interpolations. Whether this be so or not, I should wish to protest against his use of brackets to signify, not that he himself considers the passage spurious, but only that it is open to suspicion. An editor should make up his own mind, and should only bracket the traditional text when he is convinced it is unsound. Of explanatory notes Dr. Holmes has been comparatively sparing, especially on Book VIII. As he himself says, he carefully avoids giving information which can be readily found in ordinary books of reference. Serious difficulties, such as the construction of the bridge over the Rhine are treated with the thoroughness and originality characteristic of all the editor's works; in minor matters the reader is often left to his own resources, and at times warned in a way which may remind him of his school days, that he really must be careful, or must try to think for himself.

Last but not least, there is an historical and geographical commentary on the *Gallic War* which gives the pith and marrow of the editor's earlier works in the shortest possible form. Most masterly are the geographical index and the sections in the introduction on the ethnology and civilisation of Gaul, which supply in a most interesting form all the information required for an intelligent study of Caesar. In the introduction Dr. Holmes also deals briefly but sufficiently with the date and manuscripts of Caesar's commentaries, and with Stoffel's excavations of Caesar's camps. On the other hand, I am a little disappointed with the section devoted to the credibility of Caesar's narrative, as, though Dr. Holmes admits that serious charges have been brought against the general tone of Caesar's narrative, he merely refers us for details to the footnotes and to his earlier works. Now on some points of the kind the footnotes seem quite inadequate. For instance, on II. 35. 1., where most readers would see in Caesar's claim to have pacified all Gaul a patent exaggeration of his real achievement, the only comment made is 'the pacification did not last long.' Again, in III. 10. the editor will not allow that 'rebellio' bears its ordinary

meaning 'insurrection,' apparently because he fails to see that Caesar is seeking to justify his own aggression by piling up charges against the Veneti. Finally, in commenting on the treatment of the Usipetes and Tencteri, Dr. Holmes draws attention to the tremendous frankness of Caesar's avowal that he sent cavalry to massacre women and children, but never notices the charge of perfidy brought against him for his detention of the German chiefs and his sudden assault on their unprepared followers. Yet Caesar's conduct lays him open to the suspicion that his allegation of treachery against the barbarians was made to cover his own bad faith. He might safely avow a massacre, which would not as such shock the Roman public, and yet feel bound to justify or palliate a flagrant breach of the law of nations.

But enough, perhaps too much, has been said on these minor and disputable points. The commentary as a whole is worthy of Dr. Holmes; and no higher praise is possible. The maps and plans, which are for the most part reproduced from Dr. Holmes' larger works, are in every way admirable, though there is something inappropriate in inserting a plan of Namur, which he does *not* believe to be the *Atuatucorum Oppidum*. Where so much has been given it may seem ungrateful to ask for more. Yet a more detailed description of Caesar's army and a fuller account of Ancient Britain would, I am sure, be useful to English readers. If these omissions are due to the necessity of compression, space might be gained in a new edition by leaving out Appendix F and by inserting in its proper place some of the matter contained in the other appendices and in the numerous addenda. In conclusion may I express the hope that Dr. Holmes, who very rightly recommends that schoolboys should begin the higher study of Caesar by reading Part I. of his *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul* and the sixth and seventh chapters of his *Ancient Britain*, intends to republish them in a convenient form so that the English boy may share the opportunities enjoyed by the German. An even greater boon would be a com-

mentary on the *Civil War*, a work which would give full scope for Dr. Holmes' powers, and would round off and complete his unequalled contributions to the study of Caesar. Beyond question, this commentary on the

Gallic War shows all the thoroughness in investigation and lucidity in exposition which have already made his larger works classics of research.

W. W. How.

Oxford.

THE 'LOEB' *TERENCE*.

Terence. With an English translation by JOHN SARGEANT. Foolscap 8vo. Vol. I., pp. 351. Vol. II., pp. 323. (The Loeb Classical Library.) London: Wm. Heinemann. New York: The Macmillan Co., 1912. 5s. each volume.

THE recovery within the last few years of a considerable number of fragments of Menander has revived interest in the question as to how far Terence was indebted to the works of his Greek predecessor. Terence himself expressly says that he based certain of his plays on the plots of some of Menander's, and a few years ago it was a commonplace of the schools to assume that Terence's high position in literature was largely due to the art and genius of the Greek playwright, and that if we had Menander's works complete we would have the main source of Terence's inspiration. The disappearance of Menander's works, save for scattered fragments, was therefore supposed to be one of the greatest losses the literary world had experienced. Menander was regarded not only as a source of plots for Terence but also as a storehouse from which he drew most of his pithy and epigrammatic expressions, the latter view being to a certain extent supported by some of the fragments of Menander that have been long known.

It is very doubtful whether this estimate of the Greek poet can now be maintained in view of the character of the new fragments that have come to light. The witty or humorous sayings that can be added to the previously existing collection are few in number, while on the merits or the demerits of the plots even the more lengthy fragments throw little light. Scholars have indeed shown marvellous ingenuity and resource in elaborating possible plots

from some of the longer fragments, but these fragments are really quite insufficient to furnish a basis for reconstruction in any satisfactory sense, and much more are they insufficient to enable us to form a judgment as to the relative skill with which the two poets handled their materials. Indeed, in a sense, our fuller knowledge has weakened the position of Menander by not strengthening it, and his high reputation must continue to rest, as it has done in the past, on the enthusiasm expressed by his ancient admirers who had the advantage of reading his works in a complete form. So far as the data before us are concerned we must judge (in the development of plots at any rate) of what Menander *may* have done by what Terence *has* done, and not disparage the performance of the latter writer on the assumption that the former was superior.

The convenient and well-printed volumes now before us will appeal to a large circle of readers. Those who have no knowledge of Latin or who have let what they once knew grow rusty will read the spirited versions of the several plays with pleasure as affording them a glimpse into an important field of literature; while those who have a full or a partial acquaintance with the original language will enjoy the additional pleasure of appreciating the skill with which the meaning of the text is grasped by the translator (or shall we rather say paraphraser) and reproduced in idiomatic English—sometimes perhaps almost too idiomatic, especially in the use of expletives.

The custom, dating from the time of Queen Elizabeth, of acting certain of the plays at Westminster every Christmas has no doubt had a useful influence in making the versions of those plays more perfect. The actual performance

of the pieces has helped to throw clearer light on the author's meaning than could have been derived from a mere perusal of the written text, for the force of what is obscure in writing is often illuminated by the realism of living representation. The actual experience,

too, of staging the pieces has helped to suggest the stage directions that accompany the translation and that help the reader materially in following the plays with understanding and enjoyment.

C. H. KEENE.

University College, Cork.

BUTLER'S *PROPERTIUS*.

Propertius, with an English Translation.
By H. E. BUTLER. Loeb Series.
Heinemann.

THE poet Cowley has somewhere a spirited remark about translators of Pindar. It always seems, he says, 'as though one madman had translated another.' Propertius may be said to be at once easier and more difficult to translate than Pindar. He is easier because his vocabulary is less profuse in ἔπη μεγαλειωτά. He is more difficult because he is more personal and because, therefore, his translator stands in perpetual peril of being ridiculous. This art, like Poverty, *habet nil durius in se quam quod ridiculos homines facit*.

Professor Butler's *Translation* may safely be said to contain less of the mad and ridiculous than any translation that has yet appeared. Indeed, he may be said to have made Propertius more readable than one would have thought possible—or even right. Every page of his rendering bears witness to an infinite literary tact and resource. There are almost no faults of taste (though Propertius has so many); and there are endless examples of fine, or adroit, phrasing where anyone, save a most skilful craftsman, must have been spiritless or banal. Yet, though it may seem a little ungenerous to criticise a rendering which has so many, and such obvious, merits, I cannot but feel that Professor Butler has paid, for the satisfaction of not being absurd, the rather heavy price of being found somewhat conventional. A translator should have some *philosophy of translation*: and I do not feel quite sure that Professor Butler has. His work challenges comparison with that of Professor Phillimore. Professor Phillimore is often disquieting, sometimes even alarming, as a translator. One never quite knows what he will do next. One

always knows what Professor Butler will do next—it is marvellous that he should be able to do it, but one knows he will. I seem to find here some failure in ideal, in literary courage. The ordinary man will undoubtedly prefer Professor Butler's *Translation* to Professor Phillimore's—just as he prefers the Homer of Lang Leaf and Myers to that of Samuel Butler. Yet—though I shall probably make myself two enemies by saying so—I am inclined to rate Professor Phillimore's fine failure higher than the unimpeachable success of Professor Butler. It has a 'metaphysic' behind it, and that deadly courage which always accompanies metaphysic.

Some inaccuracies of scholarship are bound to find place in a translation of this kind. I note here one or two places where I feel uneasy about the renderings offered by Professor Butler. At II. 24, 10 *sqq.* does not *parcius infamant* mean simply that such connections are looked at more indulgently by respectable people? and for 'expensive' should not Professor Butler have written 'comparatively inexpensive'? At II. 24a, 41 *ista* surely means 'like yours.' At II. 34, 59 Professor Butler prints *mi lubet*, but translates *mi iuuat*. At IV. 1, 89 *produceret* means 'sent to the wars,' not 'was in travail with.' At IV. 7, 29 *portas* means not 'my portal' but 'the city gates.' At II. 22, 4; *ibid.* 14; II. 24, 6; II. 25, 6; II. 32, 44, the renderings seem loose or obscure. In a good many places Professor Butler has chosen one interpretation where I should have preferred another. But in general, his judgment in interpretation seems not inferior to his skill in phrasing: and the book may be pronounced a notable ornament of the series to which it belongs.

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College, Oxford.

ROMAN LOCAL GOVERNMENT.

Roman Laws and Charters. By E. G. HARDY, M.A., D.Litt. 2 vols. in one. Pp. v+176, iv+159. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1912. 10s. 6d. net.

DR. HARDY has reissued in one easily accessible volume his two valuable works *Six Roman Laws* and *Three Spanish Charters and other Documents*. His aim is to present the student in *Litterae Humaniores* with a guide-book to Bruns, such as may, through a carefully annotated translation, put him on the track of a great deal that is obscure, or at least difficult of access, in the original rather complex and forbidding volume. The scheme fails in one particular only. The work is too highly specialised for the average student of 'Greats.' For its author has put the whole glow of his enthusiasm into a work appertaining peculiarly to the branch of scholarship, in which he is one of a small handful of recognised masters. He would be an enthusiastic 'Greats' scholar indeed, who could find time to follow his author far into the fascinating field of study which this book opens. What, one wonders, would happen to such a reader's prospects in his philosophy and logic papers?

But after 'Schools' are done, for some students there comes a day when the subjects treated by Dr. Hardy in this book make an appeal such as they never made in days when theirs was the only claim on one's time. Then one begins to see how fruitful and withal how important are the studies herein comprised. In days when Housing Bills, Land Bills or Colonial Constitutions are the daily fare of the reading public, one is tempted to think that the publication of such documents as the *Lex Agraria* of 111 B.C., the *Lex Julia Municipalis*, passed, as Dr. Hardy proves, in 45, or the *Lex Rubria de Gallia Cisalpina*, becomes a subject of more than merely academic interest. One is tempted to regard the pages devoted in this book to the *Lex Julia Municipalis* as the crown of Dr. Hardy's work. The careful logic and brilliant exposition, which mark his explanation

of the purposes of this law, make the most interesting reading in the whole book. On the subject of this document Dr. Hardy enters into argument with Mommsen himself, and even that extreme veneration which 'humble fry' must always feel for the colossal German, gives place on this occasion to a conviction that the English scholar is right. Mommsen argued that the fragment published by Bruns, from the brass discovered at Heraclea, and that which was transferred to the Naples Museum by its English owner, Webb, in the eighteenth century, was not the *Lex Julia Municipalis* at all. That term he restricts to a *lex data* framed to organise the municipal constitution of Padua. Such an interpretation would, as says Dr. Hardy, compel the present fragment 'to go without a name in future,' and would leave in doubt the question as to whether or not there ever was any general *lex rogata* establishing a model basis for the internal organisation of all provincial towns. There is no need to follow the course of Dr. Hardy's argument on this interesting controversy. It is sufficient to say that it carries a perfect conviction that the fragments we possess do belong to Caesar's *Lex Municipalis*, and that that law did enact a general system of organisation for Italian municipalities. Any other conclusion does far less than justice to the genius of Caesar. For this *lex* is one of the greatest feats accomplished by the great Dictator. It marks the recognised transition from the stage of the city-state, with its *civitates foederatae* and *coloniae*, to the full evolution of the city that was both the greatest of all municipalities and the seat of a vast empire's government. The law represents something like the ancient idea of a Municipal Corporations Act, co-ordinating local with imperial government, and it is quite safe to say that in all antiquity no other brain than that of Caius Julius Caesar could have conceived it.

Together with the statutes of general application, which are published herein, are various particular *leges* referring to the administration and privileges of

different municipalities. All are carefully translated and edited, and an intimate study of the documents furnishes more light on Roman History than can be derived in any other way. Perhaps an old pupil may be allowed to

blend a degree of gratitude with his congratulations to Dr. Hardy on a work so admirably conceived and carefully carried out.

J. S. BLAKE REED.

Manchester.

SHORT NOTICES

Plato: Moral and Political Ideals. By A. M. ADAM. Pp. vii+159. Cambridge: University Press, 1913. Price 1s.

MRS. ADAM has accomplished her task of providing 'a clear account, intelligible to the plain man, of what Plato did in the moral and political sphere' in a very workmanlike manner. She clears the ground in her 'Preface' by expressing dissent from the revolutionary views of the Oxford scholars, Professor Burnet and Professor A. E. Taylor,—the Aloidæ of modern Platonic controversy; for indeed, if these were adopted, her intelligible account would be nearly all about 'what Plato didn't do.' After three preliminary chapters on 'Greek Ethics and Politics before Socrates,' 'The Moral and Political Teaching of Socrates,' and 'Plato as a Pupil of Socrates,' we get to work on Plato himself in chapter iv. ('Early Development of Plato's Views'). Here and in chapter v. ('Extension of Rationalism') we have an exposition of the relevant matter in the *Apology*, *Crito*, *Euthyphro*, *Laëtes*, and *Charmides*. Next come the *Protagoras* and *Meno*, under the heading 'Criticism of Contemporary Education'; followed by the *Gorgias*, *Phaedrus*, and *Euthydemus*, under the heading 'Rhetoric and Disputation.' The *Phaedo* and *Symposium* supply material for a chapter on 'The True Philosopher in Life and Death,' after which three chapters are devoted to a general review of the *Republic*, followed by three supplementary chapters on the special subjects of 'Education,' 'The Position of Women,' and 'Communism,' as treated in the *Republic* and *Laws*. The fifteenth, and last, chapter treats of 'The Philosopher in the *Politics* and *Theætetus*.' From

this summary of contents it will be seen that the whole field is well mapped out; and it would certainly be difficult for 'the plain man' to acquire so much accurate information in so concise a form from any other source. Mrs. Adam does well in letting Plato speak for himself as often as possible, and her translations are uniformly reliable.

One general criticism suggests itself. If the book is intended for popular edification would it not have been more effective if its scope had been restricted? In other words, is not the writer unduly hampered by the plan to which she ties herself? Perhaps 'I speak as a fool,' but it does seem to me that for an appeal to popular interest the style is a trifle too academic, the plan a trifle too geometric: I should have been better pleased if the gifted authoress had 'let herself go' a little more, if only on the exciting topic of 'The Position of Women.' However, this kind of criticism applies less to this particular 'manual' than to manuals in general: if the manual-mania goes on at its present rate, it threatens soon to make of the book-world a valley of dry bones. I have noticed printing errors on pp. 25, 45, 62.

R. G. B.

Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft. Herausg. von G. WISSOWA und W. KROLL. 16ter Halbband (Hestiaia—Hyagnis), and Supplement II. 2 vols. 8vo., cols. 1313-2628, and in Supplement, cols. 520. Stuttgart: Metzler, 1913. 16ter Halbband, M.15; Supplement, M.7.

THIS second Supplement differs from the first in that it contains merely two long articles which were held over from

the first part of the eighth volume, viz. those by Walter Otto on the members of the Herodian family of Judaea, especially Herod the Great (who has no less than 158 columns, surely an excessive amount in proportion to his historical importance), and by Jacoby on Herodotus. It would be absurd to attempt to criticise such articles, substantial books in themselves, in the space here available. Unfortunately the article 'Herakles,' which broke down in the middle while VIII. 1. was printing, is still awaiting. The sixteenth half-volume brings us nearly to the end of the letter H. The article to which one would naturally look forward as most important, on Homer, is disappointing. Raddatz deals in 26 columns with the Life (for which Mr. T. W. Allen's researches were doubtless published too late to be of use to him) and Witte with the Language, Metric, etc., in 34 columns. But many of the great problems of the Homeric Question, which one would naturally look to see at least broadly treated—for what is such an Encyclopaedia if not a Wegweiser?—are more or less ignored. And there is no article Epos to fall back upon.

Among the minor articles we notice a curious omission. Although the volume begins with Hestiaia, the Euboean city, by far the most important of that name, has slipped through the meshes of the editor's net. In vain to seek it under Histiaia. Possibly the omission may be repaired under Oreos. Under Hierapolis, a cross-reference should have been given to Bambyke, for the former is much the better known of the two names of the Syrian city. Hipana rather than Hippana is the correct name of the little Sicilian town, but there is no entry under the first form. The dynast Hidrieus is not entered, but, his right to the aspirate being disputed, will doubtless appear later. The Bactrian king Hippostratos has escaped. We mention these trifles not in criticism, but merely with a view to a future supplement or final supplementary index.

G. F. H.

Poseidonius und die jüdisch-christliche Genesisexegese. Von Dr. KARL GRONAU. Gr. 8, viii. 313. Leipzig and Berlin: Teubner, 1914. M. 12 geh., M. 14 geb.

IN 1912 Dr. Gronau, of Brunswick, published a thesis entitled *Poseidonius, eine Quelle für Basilus' Hexahemeros*, which is embodied in the larger work now before us. In the interval he has extended his studies to some of the writings of Gregory of Nyssa, Basil's brother, and has found that the theory is equally applicable in their case. Stated briefly, it is as follows: The purpose of these works was to satisfy the curiosity of Christians as to problems of natural science, in order to prevent them from resorting to heathen books for information. But Basil and Gregory were obliged to make use of heathen books themselves in compiling their lectures. They drew from the common stock of contemporary science, the ultimate source of which was Posidonius' commentary on the *Timaeus* of Plato. Some of this knowledge may have been mediated through Origen, but in the main it came to them from the *Hochschuletradition* of their day. This tradition was presented to the public in a Christian garb, being adapted to the purposes of a commentary on the Creation narrative of Genesis.

The theory is not, of course, new. Gregory himself described his brother as the modern Moses, skilled in the wisdom of Egypt (*De Vit. Moy. Patr. Gr.*, xlv. 360), while Jackson in his translation of the *Hexahemeron* (Oxford, 1895) gives notes showing Basil's dependence on Greek philosophy. But Dr. Gronau has worked out his thesis in so detailed a fashion and with such a wealth of illustration as to leave no doubt as to its correctness. The Cappadocian Fathers are revealed as 'spoiling the Egyptians' to good purpose; they were the true heirs of the philosophers and scientists of ancient Greece. The reviewer has given some years to a study of Basil's life and writings from another point of view, and feels much satisfaction at finding such appreciation given to the great Cappadocian from the classical side.

The learned author would have strengthened his case still further by a short account of the actual education of Basil at Caesarea, under Libanius at Constantinople, and finally at the University of Athens; from the biographical details at our disposal it is clear that his education was identical with that which a young pagan of similar antecedents would have received. A long note on p. 255 on the Stoic element in Basil's *Constitutiones Monasticae* is superfluous, as the work is universally recognised as spurious. In his discussion of the literary history of Basil's *Hexahemeron* (pp. 4-6, 293) Dr. Gronau has apparently omitted to notice Socrates' testimony, that Gregory of Nyssa acted as Basil's literary executor and edited the *Hexahemeron* (*H.E.* iv. 26). On p. 303 stress is laid on the fact that Basil never studied at Alexandria; but he visited Alexandria (*Ep.* I, *Reg. Brev. Tract.*, 254), and spent some years at Athens in company with Gregory of Nazianzus, whose education had been partly carried out at Alexandria.

We welcome the promise of further studies in the same field which the author holds out in his preface. The fourth century contains much of supreme interest and importance outside the dogmatic controversies, which have been allowed in the past to claim more than their share of attention.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Cavendish, Suffolk.

Tafeln für Sonne, Planeten und Mond nebst Tafeln der Mondphasen für die Zeit 4000 vor Chr. bis 3000 nach Chr. Dr. PAUL V. NEUGEBAUER. Pp. xxx. + 117. Leipzig: J. C. Hinrichs, 1914. M. 7; bound, M. 8.

It is not very often that the historian has occasion to inquire the position of a heavenly body at a date in the past; but the information is sometimes needed in order to interpret some obscure reference to astronomical phenomena, or to settle a doubtful point of chronology. When the calculation is required, it is a laborious task to search out and apply the ordinary astronomical formulae and tables, which are prepared mainly to meet the needs of current ephemerides;

and, in the case of an isolated inquiry, much time is likely to be spent in a preliminary study of the necessary procedure. Dr. Neugebauer has undertaken to provide tables by which anyone, whether possessed of astronomical knowledge or not, may without much labour calculate the positions of the heavenly bodies with all the accuracy likely to be required for historical purposes. The places of the principal fixed stars have already been provided for in an earlier publication, and the present work relates to the sun, moon, and planets. Two introductory explanations are given, the one addressed to astronomers and the other to those who have no special knowledge of the subject. For the latter, the instructions are given in such a form as to make the computation an almost mechanical procedure. A little knowledge of trigonometry is presumed, and doubtless also it would be necessary to have some familiarity with the use of mathematical tables in general; but there is no need to know anything about orbits and perturbations in order to make use of this book. The resulting positions will be found with an accuracy of about one-tenth of a degree; it might, perhaps, have been useful to have indicated the possible abbreviations of the work when a lower degree of accuracy suffices. The tables are admirably planned; in particular, only the simplest interpolations are needed. From a rough trial we have found that the place of Jupiter for an arbitrary date can be calculated in about three-quarters of an hour, the greater part of the labour consisting in the reduction of the position seen from the sun to the position seen from the earth. It is safe to assert that no other tables exist which would enable the result to be obtained with anything approaching that rapidity.

A. S. EDDINGTON.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

Titi Livi a.u.c. libri; ed. pr. curavit. GUIL. WEISSENBORN, ed. alt. curavit GUIL. HERAEUS. Pars V., Fasc. II., lib. XLI-CXLII. Leipzig: Teubner.

THIS volume completes the Teubner revision of Weissenborn, begun by the

late M. Mueller, and has the same characteristics as Dr. Heraeus' volume of books 39, 40, noticed in the *Classical Review* of May, 1912. The publisher's stitching in the paper-edition is of the usual kind; you can unhitch without trouble nearly the whole of the Critical Apparatus; this is an advantage, as it is all placed at the beginning. The title-page is somewhat misleading, but the threat is unfulfilled, for books 46-142 are represented only by the *Periochae*, without even the Vatican fragment of 91. Moreover, the volume is rather a revision of the late A. Zingerle's edition (1899-1908) than of Weissenborn, and the Critical Apparatus is merely an Index of differences from that edition, not from Weissenborn's.

To a student of the history of the text, therefore, Zingerle's edition would be still indispensable, as indeed it is occasionally to make this Apparatus intelligible—*e.g.*, in 44. 22. 17, *esse* occurs twice, and Heraeus does not say which he 'recalls.'

The problems presented by these books are much the same as in books 21 to 26: in each case we are dependent on a single uncial MS., Puteaneus and Vindobonensis, both happily available for modern scholars now in copies, useful for revision-work. To the enterprising house of Froben, so wise and fortunate in obtaining for his *Livy* such editors as Grynaeus (1531) and Rhenanus with Gelenius (in 1555), we owe the 'editio princeps' of this portion of *Livy*; and to all editors of the books from Grynaeus downwards it has been, like 21-26, the happy field for the exercise of free conjectures or free composition (though not on a Freinsheimian scale), and for playing the jackal to the lions of scholarship. Naturally, therefore, the Critical Apparatus consists largely of such conjectures, and an editor's business is to present all that he thinks worth mentioning, and the best way to do this would be to marshal them at the foot of the page of text; what he should print as the text is another matter. The name that figures most largely in this portion of *Livy* is that of Vahlen, whose conjectures are, as I think,

rightly estimated by the editor. Heraeus, of course, has some of his own to offer, of varying merit, but some that should certainly stay; in a number of places he has wisely restored the reading of the MS.—*e.g.*, *sumpserunt* (V and Grynaeus), 43. 2. 6; and throughout his preface shown his usual fine scholarship.

The misprints that I have noticed are few, three or four in the Preface in the numbers of the sections: at 45. 5. 1, he says *scripsi* 'cum Cn. Octavio,' but has not so printed in the text.

C. F. WALTERS.

MOMMSEN'S GESAMMELTE SCHRIFTEN, VOL. VIII.

Gesammelte Schriften. Von THEODOR MOMMSEN. Achter Band. Vol. 1 8vo. Pp. vii + 626. Epigraphische u. Numismatische Schriften, erster Band. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. M. 18.

THE collection and republication of Mommsen's miscellaneous papers and monographs in an orderly and continuous series makes good progress. We have already had three volumes on Law, three on History, and one on Literature and Scholarship. The eighth volume is now before us, and opens an epigraphic and numismatic group. Its own contents are epigraphic. They comprise, first, the series of papers which, in his early days, in 1849-52, Mommsen contributed to the Royal Saxon Society of Sciences at Leipzig, under the title of 'Epigraphische Analekten'; secondly, the 'Observationes Epigraphicae' which he issued in the *Ephemeris Epigraphica* at various dates between 1872 and 1892; and, thirdly, the shorter monograph on the well-known inscription of the 'Ludi Saeculares' which appeared in the *Ephemeris* in 1891. The first group of papers is written in German, the latter two in Latin. All alike have been edited by Professor H. Dessau, of Berlin, whose eminence as Roman epigraphist and historian is well known to all men and questioned by none. Few men spend as much labour on their own work as he has spent on that of Mommsen. Almost every page gives

proof of minute, scrupulous, and loving care. Sometimes (it was, naturally, seldom necessary) an item is omitted or corrected; often, later discoveries and later treatises are noted; all old references are brought up to date; where suitable, new ones are added. The whole has been carried through with equally admirable learning and judgment and accuracy. In the fullest sense of the words, the editing is worthy of the great man whose work is edited.

The volume is, of course, primarily important to historians and epigraphists. Like its seven predecessors, it is a publication which no self-respecting student of Roman History will neglect. But it contains also not a little to interest the scholar. Its very first page deals with the famous fiction of the Roman 'theatreticket' which mentioned the *Casina* of Plautus. A little further comes a note, based on inscriptions, as to the *nomen* of Verres. Another paper, dealing with the *Acts* of the Arval Brothers, deals also with Roman orthography. The subject of the Secular Games is, of course, inextricably connected with Horace. Most scholars would be glad if (after their deaths) their miscellaneous papers sufficed to fill one volume of such great and such varied learning. The papers of Mommsen in this volume are only one-eighth of a series which is not yet nearly finished. F. H.

Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Metamorphoseon Libri XI. Iterum edidit RUDOLFUS HELM. 8vo. Pp. viii+296. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 3, sewn; M. 3.40, bound.

HELM's first edition of the *Metamorphoses* was published in 1907; and it is creditable to the world of scholarship that it should so soon have been exhausted, for it is almost a model of what a critical edition should be. The *Metamorphoses* should not be difficult to edit; the text depends on one manuscript, which is good on the whole, and the errors are generally obvious (though their correction is not always obvious) where they occur: but it is certain that until the time of Helm Apuleius was not well served by his editors, and his edition easily supersedes all the rest.

He follows his manuscript very closely¹: his corrections are extremely judicious, and he displays a quite remarkable familiarity with the very scattered work that has been done on the criticism of the text.

The new edition varies very little from the old. Suggestions made since 1907 are incorporated in the critical notes; otherwise alterations are very few; in xi. 18, Mommsen's *πλοιαφέσια* rightly takes its place in the text. The book is, for a standard edition, rather carelessly printed: in the last hundred pages occur; p. 203, l. 26, *cibicularium*; p. 204, l. 17, *cibiculi* (the critical note on the second passage shows that these are misprints); p. 208, l. 1, *purgandam*; p. 215, l. 12, *uxerem*; and p. 277, l. 8, *lubrio*, were all correct in the 1907 issue; p. 265, l. 1, *porumpit*, and p. 269, l. 23, *uestustam*, were wrong in the first edition as well. These slips can probably be corrected in the stereotyped plates. S. G.

Apulei Platonici Madaurensis pro se de Magia liber (Apologia). Iterum edidit RUDOLFUS HELM. Teubner Series. M. 2.40, unbound; M. 2.80, bound.

THIS is a new edition of Helm's well-known text of the *Apologia* of Apuleius. The Apparatus Criticus has been carefully brought up to date, and is fuller and more serviceable than that of the first edition. The text differs but little from the preceding. A few passages have been obelised, where conjectures were previously admitted, and there are a few new readings. In c. 9 (p. 11, ll. 17 and 19) Helm now retains the reading of the MSS. *das*, while he alters *redde* to *reddes*. This, though obviously not impossible, lacks the vigour of the usually accepted reading *des* and *redde*. In the fragment of Ennius (c. 39, p. 45, l. 1) he reads *Charadrumque apud Ambraciac sus*. This is perhaps the best

¹ Even to inconsistencies of spelling—e.g., *Photis* and *Fotis*, *proximus* and *proximus*, *nuptiae* and *nubtiac*. Some future editor will have to make up his mind as to the forms actually employed by Apuleius, and the task will not be easy, owing to the deliberate archaisms of the writer's vocabulary.

emendation of a hopelessly corrupt passage. In support of this he cites *Athen.*, 7, 326, where Arcestratus, the author whom Ennius is paraphrasing, is quoted as saying ἐν δ' Αἰνῶ καὶ τῷ Πόντῳ τὴν ὕν ἀγόραζε. The objection to the emendation is that the localities differ. But *suf* and *finis* might easily be confused, and there is much to be said for the suggestion, though it is perhaps rash to insert any conjecture in the text at this particular point. This is not the place to criticise the text as a whole. It is now well known, and, whatever its deficiencies in points of detail, marks an epoch in the history of Apuleian criticism. The collation of F is a model of accuracy. The reviewer has checked it with the MS. throughout, and has found scarcely a single error, although at times the editor seems to express himself too confidently as to what the original reading may have been. There is a small slip in the Apparatus Criticus on p. 73, l. 25, where it is stated that the MSS. of Plato read εὐαγές. This is not borne out by the Apparatus Criticus of Burnet's *Plato* (*Leges*, p. 956), sc. 'εὐαγές Clemens Eus.: εὐχερής libri.' The one serious criticism, however, that we would pass upon the book is that the Apparatus Criticus is overcrowded with conjectures, many of which have no real interest and importance, and that it needs very careful reading owing to the many abbreviations and the closeness of the type. There can be few Apparatus Critici which are so tiresome to use. It is to be regretted that the publishers could not see their way to giving the editor considerably greater space. Had they done so, they would have removed a blemish from one of the best texts in their series.

H. E. BUTLER.

University College, London.

Poetae Latini Minores. Post Aemilium Bachrens iterum recensuit FRIDERICUS VOLLMER. Vol. II., Fasc. iii., *Homerus Latinus.* Teubner, 1913. M. 1.20.

WITH this little work, Mr. Vollmer brings his recension of Bachrens a stage

nearer the goal. It contains the thousand and odd verses in which Baebius Italicus¹ has enshrined the Iliad and his name; an index nominum; a preface, erring perhaps on the side of brevity (for not every reader can instantly refresh his memory with the Munich *Sitzungsberichte*); and a critical apparatus which, for the present, must be regarded as superseding all others. No detailed review of the text is possible here. It is based on an examination, or re-examination, of the whole ponderable manuscript material; and, though the editor indulges in one or two of his favourite exegetical bizzarries, he has introduced a substantial quantity of plausible, or more than plausible, corrections. A noticeable feature is the number of lacunae indicated, in most cases with something approaching certainty: the supplement, for instance, to v. 293, if not verbally exact, must, at any rate, be essentially so. There is an indubitable emendation—*anguineis* for *sanguineis*—at 891, a neat and equally indubitable change of punctuation at 489; and at 365 one heaves a sigh of relief at the passing of the purple soul. The selection of conjectures by former critics is generally adequate, though one or two omissions might be regretted. A minor, but welcome, innovation is the absence of the time-honoured and futile dissection of the poem into twenty-four books, and its replacement by marginal references to the Iliad.

J. JACKSON.

Caldbeck, Cumberland.

Vie de Porphyre. Par J. BIDEZ. Pp. vii + 166 + 73*. Teubner, 1913. M. 6.

OF the Neo-platonic masters Porphyry is, as M. Bidez observes, 'at once one of the most famous and one of the least understood.' For the history of his life practically the only reliable source is

¹ Mr. Vollmer adopts the full name, published by Schenkl, in 1890, from the *Vindobonensis*. His remark is incontrovertible: *Librarius ille qui acrostichide non perspecta proferre poterat iustum cognomen ITALICVS idem si gentile addidit BEBIVS, ego non dubito quin utrumque ex bono puroque hauserit fonte, scilicet ex codice carminis deperdito.*

to be found in his own writings, and the information they supply is very partial and incomplete. And in treating of his philosophic views the practice of historians like Zeller has been to take them *en bloc* without attempting anything in the way of a chronological differentiation. Hence we are faced with many unsolved problems: What was the early education of Porphyry? How far did he depart from his first beliefs? How far did he hold or publish at one and the same time contradictory views? In what points did he alter the doctrine of Plotinus? What was his real attitude to the pagan superstitions of his age? How far was he instrumental in causing the ideas of Plotinus to percolate into Christian literature? It is problems of this kind which M. Bidez helps us to solve in this important contribution to the study of third-century Neoplatonism. In fourteen chapters he reconstructs for us the main outlines of the life of Porphyry; and to this biography he adds four 'Appendices'—

each containing both 'Introduction' and 'Text'—giving (1) the treatise *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων*; (2) the *De regressu animæ*; (3) extracts from Eunapius, Suidas, and Arab authors on the life and works of Porphyry; (4) a list of the writings of Porphyry. The fragments of the *Περὶ ἀγαλμάτων* are mostly drawn from Eusebius, *Præf. Evang.* III., and those of the *de regressu* from Augustine, *Civ. D.* X.; for the latter M. Bidez prints Dombart's text, and in his handling of the former he acknowledges obligations to the dissertation of F. Börtzler. Subjoined to the texts are critical foot-notes and the relevant *testimonia*. In the Greek text there are a number of places in which the reading is open to doubt, and M. Bidez notes various conjectures: one such is on p. 51*, l. 8, where for *εἰκάξειν* (*ἀκμάξειν* cj. Wyttenbach) it may be worth while to propose *διαζῆν* (for *εἰ* = *δ*, see Bast); and at p. 20*, l. 2, I should like to read, for *αἰροῦσα, ἀνείσα* (with play on *ἴσις*).

R. G. BURY.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

* * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Appleton (R. B.) and Jones (W. H. S.) *Pons Tironum*. 7½" × 5". Pp. 112. London: Geo. Bell and Sons. Cloth, 1s.

Bardt (C.) *Die Sermonen des Q. Horatius Flaccus* (Deutsch). 4te Auflage. 7½" × 5". Pp. viii + 258. Berlin: Weidmann and Co., 1914. M. 4.

Bennett (C. E.) *Syntax of Early Latin*. Vol. I., *The Verb*, pp. xix + 506; Vol. II., *The Cases*, pp. x + 409. 8½" × 6". Boston: Allyn and Bacon, 1914. Cloth, \$4 each vol.

Boas (F. S.) *University Drama in the Tudor Age*. 9" × 6". Pp. xii + 416. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Cloth, 14s. net.

Burnet (J.) *Greek Philosophy*. Part I. *Thales to Plato*. 8½" × 5½". Pp. x + 360. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. 10s. net.

Butler (H. M.) *Some Leisure Hours of a Long Life*. Translations into Greek, Latin, and English verse, from 1850 to 1914. 7½" × 5". Pp. xvi + 593. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes, 1914. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Cauer (P.) *Die Kunst des Übersetzens*. 8½" × 5½". Pp. viii + 178. Berlin: Weidmann and Co., 1914. Cloth, M. 4.

Clark (A. C.) *Recent Developments in Textual Criticism* (Inaugural Lecture). 9" × 6". Pp. 28. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 1s. net.

Commentationes Philologae Ienenses. Vol. XI., Fasc. II. *Priscorum poetarum et scriptorum de se et aliis iudicia*. 8½" × 5½". Pp. 115. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 2.40.

Demosthenes and the Last Days of Greek Freedom (384-322 B.C.). By A. W. Pickard Cambridge. *Heroes of the Nations' Series*. 7½" × 5". Pp. xxiv + 512. London: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net.

Euripides (*Alcestis*). Greek Text with English Translation by boys of Bradfield College. 7½" × 5". Pp. 47. Oxford: University Press, 1914. 1s. 6d. net.

Fischer (W.) *Das Römische Lager insbesondere nach Livius*. 9" × 6". Pp. iv + 207. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 7.

- Homer* (Ilias). By E. Bethe Dichtung und Sage; Erster Band. $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6''$. Pp. xii+374. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 8.
- Lamb* (W. R. M.) *Clio Enthroned: A Study of Prose-form in Thucydides*. $9'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xvi+320. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 10s. net.
- Laurand* (L.) *Manuel des Etudes Grecques et Latines*. Fasc. I.: *Geographie, Histoire, Institutions grecques*, pp. vi+98+8. Fasc. II.: *Littérature Grecque*, pp. 99+260+16. Paris: Auguste Picard, 1914. Fr. 1.50 per vol.
- Lehmann* (P.) *Vom Mittelalter und von der Lateinischen Philologie des Mittelalters*. $10'' \times 7''$. Pp. 24. München: O. Beck, 1914. M. 1.20.
- Livy*. *The Revolt and Fall of Capua*. T. C. Weatherhead. $6\frac{3}{4}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. xlii+166. With 3 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 2s.
- Lloyd* (T.) *The Making of the Roman People*. $9'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. viii+136. London: Longmans and Co., 1914. Cloth, 4s. 6d. net.
- Loeb Library*. *Suetonius* (J. C. Rolfe), Vol. II., pp. 556. *Cicero, De Finibus* (H. Rackham), pp. xxx+512. *Xenophon, Cyropaedia* (W. Miller), pp. xvi+400. London: W. Heinemann, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net each.
- Palaeographia Latina*. *Exempla Codicum Latinorum Phototypice Expressa Scholarum maxime in usum*. Edidit Maximilianus Ihm, Series I. $14'' \times 17\frac{1}{2}''$. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner.
- Proceedings of the Classical Association* (Vol. XI.). $8\frac{1}{2}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 196. London: John Murray, 1914. 2s. 6d. net.
- Rodenberg* (J.) *Deutsche Rundschau: 40 Jahrgang, Heft 10*. $10'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 160. Berlin: G. Paetel, 1914. M. 2.50.
- Rolleston* (J. D.) *The Medical Aspects of the Greek Anthology (extracted from Janus)*. $10'' \times 6\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. 38. Leyden: E. J. Brill, 1914.
- Ryle* (E.) *Olion (Ludi Scenici)*. $7'' \times 5''$. Pp. 54. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914. Limp cloth, 1s.
- Samler* (E.) *Die Religion der Griechen*. $7'' \times 4\frac{3}{4}''$. Pp. 86+16 (illustrated supplement). Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 1.25.
- Schonack* (W.) *Ein Jahrhundert Berliner Philologischer Dissertationen (1810-1910)*. $8\frac{3}{8}'' \times 5\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. x+232. Wolfenbüttel: J. Zwissler, 1914. M. 4.50.
- Skutsch* (F.) *Kleine Schriften, herausgegeben von W. Kroll*. $9'' \times 6''$. Pp. xxvi+531. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 20.
- Spiess* (G.) *Instrumenta Graeca Publica et Privata. Pars Altera. Accedunt III. tabulae phototypicae*. $9\frac{1}{2}'' \times 6\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 129-160. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 4.50.
- Studniczka* (F.) *Das Symposion Ptolemaios II. No. 11., mit 51 Abbildungen im Text und 3 Tafeln*. $11\frac{1}{2}'' \times 7\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. 188. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 9.
- Tacitus* (Historiarum Libri) *Erstes Heft, Buch I. and II. (Wolff), 2te Auflage*. $8'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. iv+290. Berlin: Weidmann and Co., 1914. M. 3.60.
- Teubner's Texts*. *Demosthenis Orationes* (Fuhr), Editio Major, Vol. I., pp. xxxii+535, M. 4.50. *Xenophontis Ἀθηναίων Πολιτεία* (Kalinka), pp. xxx+26, M. 1. *Heronis Alexandrini Opera quae supersunt* (Heiberg), Vol. V., pp. cxxvi+275, M. 10. $7\frac{1}{4}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914.
- *Poetae Latini Minores* (Vollmer), Vol. V. $6\frac{3}{4}'' \times 4\frac{1}{2}''$. Pp. viii+268. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 8.
- Thomson* (J. A. K.) *Studies in the Odyssey*. $9\frac{1}{4}'' \times 5\frac{3}{4}''$. Pp. xii+250. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.
- Thucydides* (von J. Classen). *Zweiter Band, Zweites Buch, 5te Auflage bearbeitet von J. Steup*. $8'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. iv+330. Berlin: Weidmann and Co., 1914. M. 3.60.
- Wecklein* (N.) *Iphigenie in Aulis*. $8\frac{1}{4}'' \times 5\frac{1}{4}''$. Pp. xv+93. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 1.80.
- Zander* (C.) *Eurythmia, vel Compositio Rhythmica Prosae Antiquae. III. Eurythmia Ciceronis*. $10'' \times 7''$. Pp. 272. Leipzig: O. Harrassowitz, 1914. M. 8.

The Classical Review

SEPTEMBER, 1914

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

SOCRATES AND THE ΔΑΙΜΟΝΙΟΝ.

It has generally been the custom to translate the word 'δαιμόνιον'—whether used by Xenophon or Plato in regard to the claims of Socrates to special divine intervention—as if it were equivalent to δαίμων. Thus Lélut, who devoted a whole book to the subject, brought out his work under the title of '*Le démon de Socrate*.' It is the object of the present paper to show that there is no justification for such a confusion of the two words, and also to show by a careful examination of all the passages where the word δαιμόνιον is used either in Xenophon or Plato in regard to Socrates that there is no connection between the words δαιμόνιον and δαίμων.

There has also been a tendency to arrive at conclusions by disregarding part of the evidence. The extent to which this tendency has prevailed is well illustrated by the essay on τὸ δαιμόνιον, which was appended to his edition of the *Apology* by the late Rev. James Riddell, Fellow and Tutor of Balliol College, Oxford. He takes what he calls 'the chief passages' in Xenophon in regard to the 'δαιμόνιον σημεῖον,' and then makes the following statement: 'Thus we see that Xenophon tells us nothing as to the nature of Socrates' δαιμόνιον, save that it was the instrument through which divine intimations reached him unsolicited.' But as a matter of fact Mr. Riddell arrives at this conclusion, by omitting altogether a number of passages in which the word

δαιμόνιον is used; while incidentally it should be noticed that Xenophon never uses the actual words 'δαιμόνιον σημεῖον' at all.

I submit that a careful and complete study of the word δαιμόνιον in the *Memorabilia* is the only satisfactory method of attaining to the real meaning which Xenophon meant the word to convey. And if there is any one English word which, after such an examination, can be used, without violating the sense, to translate the Greek δαιμόνιον in every single instance where it is employed by Xenophon, it would seem that we should be justified in believing that we have obtained an adequate translation. This is the method employed in the interpretation of particular words and phrases in elucidating such documents as wills and settlements; and it would seem to be the only satisfactory or scientific method. The particular author must be his own interpreter.

Now the first time that the word δαιμόνιον occurs in the *Memorabilia* is in Book I., ch. 1, § 1. ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης οὓς μὲν ἡ πόλις νομίζει θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων, ἕτερα δὲ καὶνὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρειν. [Socrates is indicted for not believing in the gods in whom the State believes, and for introducing other new deities.]

Even apart from other passages in the *Memorabilia*, δαιμόνιον here would appear to be an alternative synonym for θεός; and we shall presently see that this view

is confirmed by three separate passages in different parts of the *Memorabilia*.

The next passage is in section 2 of ch. 1, Book I.: διετεθρύλητο γὰρ ὡς φαίη Σωκράτης τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐαυτῷ σημαίνειν ὅθεν δὴ καὶ μάλιστα μοι δοκοῦσιν αὐτὸν αἰτιάσασθαι καινὰ δαιμόνια εἰσφέρειν. Here the word is used twice—once in the singular and once in the plural—in two lines; and the same meaning must obviously be given, if possible, in both instances. And as καινὰ δαιμόνια must mean (as before) 'new deities' (or 'divinities'), τὸ δαιμόνιον must mean 'the deity.'

The other passages in Xenophon are Book I., ch. 1, § 4: Σωκράτης δ' ὥσπερ ἐγίγνωσκεν, οὕτως ἔλεγε. τὸ δαιμόνιον γὰρ ἔφη σημαίνειν καὶ πολλοῖς τῶν συνόντων προηγόρευε τὰ μὲν ποιεῖν, τὰ δὲ μὴ ποιεῖν, ὡς τοῦ δαιμόνιου προσημαίνοντος. καὶ τοῖς μὲν πειθομένοις αὐτῷ συνέφερε, τοῖς δὲ μὴ πειθομένοις μετέμελε. καίτοι τίς οὐκ ἂν ὁμολογήσειεν αὐτὸν βούλεσθαι μὴτ' ἡλίθιον μὴτ' ἀλάξονα φαίνεσθαι τοῖς συνοῦσιν; ἐδόκει δ' ἂν ἀμφότερα ταῦτα, εἰ προαγορεύων ὡς ὑπὸ θεοῦ φαινόμενα, καὶ ψευδόμενος ἐφαίνετο. N.B. In this passage, similarly but conversely to the first, θεός would seem to be an alternative synonym for δαιμόνιον; and τὸ δαιμόνιον must in each case be translated 'the deity.'

Book I., ch. 3, § 4, where the word δαιμόνιον is not actually used, but οἱ θεοὶ seem to be the equivalent. εἰ δέ τι δόξειεν αὐτῷ σημαίνεσθαι παρὰ τῶν θεῶν, ἥττον ἂν ἐπείσθη παρὰ τὰ σημαίνόμενα ποιῆσαι, ἢ εἰ τις αὐτὸν ἐπειθεν ὁδοῦ λαβεῖν ἡγέμονα τυφλὸν καὶ μὴ εἰδότα τὴν ὁδόν, ἀντί βλέποντος καὶ εἰδότος.

Book I., ch. 4, § 2: λέξω δὲ πρῶτον ἃ ποτε αὐτοῦ ἤκουσα περὶ τοῦ δαιμονίου διαλεγόμενον πρὸς Ἀριστόδημον τὸν μικρὸν ἐπικαλούμενον. It is impossible to quote the whole context, which is somewhat lengthy, but a careful study of the chapter will show that τὸ δαιμόνιον in this particular passage cannot refer to the special revelation of the deity to which Socrates laid claim; for the whole purport of the chapter is to prove the existence of the deity by the wonders of man's bodily and mental powers. And that the words τὸ δαιμόνιον as used here by

Xenophon are really an alternative synonym for θεοί or ὁ θεός seems especially clear from the frequent use of those words as alternative terms in Book I., ch. 4, §§ 10-19. Thus in § 10 we find καὶ ὁ Ἀριστόδημος, Οὔτοι, ἔφη, ἐγώ, ὦ Σώκρατες, ὑπερορῶ τὸ δαιμόνιον, ἀλλ' ἐκείνο μεγαλοπρεπέστερον ἡγοῦμαι ἢ ὡς τῆς ἐμῆς θεραπείας προσδεῖσθαι. ('And Aristodemus said, Neither do I, O Socrates, contemn the deity, but I deem it too magnificent to require my service.') In the remainder of the argument—which is continued till the end of the chapter—the word θεοί is used seven times, οἱ θεοί is used (alternatively) twice, ὁ θεός is used (alternatively) three times, and τὸ θεῖον is used (alternatively) once.

In Book IV., ch. 3, Socrates once more expatiates on the divine goodness as made manifest to men. From section 12 to section 18 the words οἱ θεοί are used seven times, the word θεοί is used three times, the words τὸ θεῖον once, and the words τὸ δαιμόνιον twice; and the context seems clearly to show that these different words in each case refer to the same thing, just as in English we might alternatively employ the terms 'god,' 'the godhead,' 'the deity,' or 'the divinity.'

And that the words τὸ δαιμόνιον, which are twice used in this passage, must refer to the deity in general is apparent not only from the whole argument, but from the actual context in which they occur, in IV. 3. 14: ἃ χρὴ κατανοοῦντα μὴ καταφρονεῖν τῶν ἀοράτων, ἀλλ' ἐκ τῶν γιγνομένων τὴν δύναμιν αὐτῶν καταμανθάνοντα τιμᾶν τὸ δαιμόνιον. Ἐγὼ μὲν, ὦ Σώκρατες, ἔφη ὁ Εὐθύδημος, ὅτι μὲν οὐδὲ μικρὸν ἀμελήσω τοῦ δαιμονίου σαφῶς οἶδα. ἐκείνο δὲ ἄθυμῶ, ὅτι μοι δοκεῖ τὰς τῶν θεῶν εὐεργεσίας οὐδ' ἂν εἰς ποτε ἀνθρώπων ἀξίαις χάρισιν ἀμείβεσθαι.

In Book IV. the expression τὸ δαιμόνιον occurs again, and is used thrice. Even here, though primarily referring to the particular manifestation claimed by Socrates, it also clearly refers to the deity in general. This is, I think, made certain by the fact that in the latter of the two passages to be quoted, the words τῷ θεῷ are evidently synonymous with the τὸ δαιμόνιον used just before.

(a) Ch. 8, § 1: Εἰ δέ τις, ὅτι φάσκοντος αὐτοῦ τὸ δαιμόνιον ἐαυτῷ προσημαίνειν ἃ τε δέοι καὶ ἃ μὴ δέοι ποιεῖν ὑπὸ τῶν δικαστῶν κατεγνώσθη θάνατος, οἶεται αὐτὸν ἐλέγχεσθαι περὶ τοῦ δαιμονίου ψευδόμενον, ἐννοησάτω πρῶτον μὲν ὅτι οὕτως ἤδη τότε πόρρω τῆς ἡλικίας ἦν, ὥστ' εἰ καὶ μὴ τότε, οὐκ ἂν πολλῷ ὕστερον τελευτῆσαι τὸν βίον.

(b) Ch. 8, §§ 5 and 6: αὐτὸς δὲ πάλιν εἰπεῖν, Οὐχ ὁρᾷς, ὦ Σώκρατες, ὅτι οἱ Ἀθήνησι δεῖσται πολλοὺς μὲν ἤδη μηδὲν ἀδικούντας λόγῳ παραχθέντες ἀπέκτειναν, πολλοὺς δὲ ἀδικούντας ἀπέλυσαν; Ἀλλὰ νῆ τὸν Δία, φάναι αὐτόν, ὦ Ἐρμόγενης, ἤδη μου ἐπιχειροῦντος φροντίσαι τῆς πρὸς τοὺς δικαστὰς ἀπολογίας ἡναντιώθη τὸ δαιμόνιον, καὶ αὐτὸς εἰπεῖν, Θυμαστὰ λέγεις. τὸν δέ, Θαυμάζεις, φάναι, εἰ τῷ θεῷ δοκεῖ βέλτιον εἶναι ἐμὲ τελευτᾶν τὸν βίον ἤδη;

[Note.—Xenophon also uses the word δαιμόνιος as an adjective in three places in the *Memorabilia*, (a) Book I., ch. 1, § 9: τοὺς δὲ μηδὲν τῶν τοιούτων οἰόμενους εἶναι δαιμόνιον, ἀλλὰ πάντα τῆς ἀνθρωπίνης γνώμης, δαιμονῶν ἔφη. (b) Book I., ch. 1, § 12: τὰ μὲν ἀνθρώπεια παρέντες, τὰ δαιμόνια δὲ σκοποῦντες. (c) Book I., ch. 3, § 5: εἰ μὴ τι δαιμόνιον εἴη. In none of these three passages has the word any bearing on the subject of our inquiry.]

So far then as Xenophon is concerned, we find that he uses the word δαιμόνιον as a substantive twelve times in all in the *Memorabilia*. At least six times the reference is clearly general, and has no primary or direct connection with the particular manifestation of the deity to which Socrates laid claim. Of the other six instances where the word is used, there is no real reason why the first five should not have a general reference, even though they also apply to the warnings which Socrates stated that he received. And in the last instance (Book IV., chapter 8, section 5) the immediate collocation of the words τῷ θεῷ would seem to show that even here τὸ δαιμόνιον is merely as alternative for ὁ θεός. Under these circumstances it would seem doubtful whether such an expression as the 'daemon of Socrates' can in any way be warranted by the facts of the case. In other words, so far at least as Xenophon is concerned,

it would seem that wherever the word δαιμόνιον is used the most natural and reasonable translation is supplied by the English word 'deity' (or 'divinity').

I submit, therefore, that so far as Xenophon is concerned, Mr. Riddell's assertion that 'τὸ δαιμόνιον is but the instrument, while it is the gods who are the agents' is entirely unwarranted; seeing that in two different chapters the words 'τὸ δαιμόνιον,' 'θεοὶ,' 'οἱ θεοί,' and 'ὁ θεός,' are clearly used as alternative terms to express the deity. And when Mr. Riddell further states that 'all Xenophon's notices of it encourage the view that it was the quick exercise of a judgment informed by knowledge of the subject, trained by experience, and inferring from cause to effect without consciousness of the process,' it is clear that he can only make such a statement by neglecting, as he has done, the passages which disprove it. Thus he omits *Mem.* I. i., 1, *Mem.* I. iii., 4, *Mem.* I. iv., 10, *Mem.* IV. iii., 14; whereas to obtain Xenophon's real meaning it is clearly necessary to examine the meaning of the word, wherever it occurs in his pages.

When we turn to Plato, and examine his use of the word δαιμόνιον we find a curious difference. Xenophon, as we have seen, always uses the word as a substantive; but in Plato we find a double usage, sometimes adjectival, and sometimes substantival. The substantival usage appears to occur four times.

(a) *Euthyphro*. 2 b: ΕΤΘ. καὶ μοι λέγε, τί καὶ ποιοῦντά σέ φησι διαφθεῖρειν τοὺς νέους; ΣΩ. Ἀτοπα, ὦ θαυμάστε, ὡς οὕτω γ' ἀκοῦσαι. φησὶ γάρ με ποιητὴν εἶναι θεῶν, καὶ ὡς καινοὺς ποιοῦντα θεοὺς τοὺς δ' ἀρχαίους οὐ νομίζοντα ἐγράψατο τούτων αὐτῶν ἕνεκα, ὡς φησιν. ΕΤΘ. Μανθάνω, ὦ Σώκρατες. ὅτι δὴ σὺ τὸ δαιμόνιον φῆς σαυτῷ ἐκάστοτε γίγνεσθαι.

It is hard to see how δαιμόνιον here can be translated by any other word than 'deity' (or 'divinity'). Moreover, it must be noticed that whereas in the indictment as given in Xenophon the words used are καὶ δαιμόνια (*Mem.* Book I., ch. i., § 1.), and the same phrase is used in the *Apology* (ἕτερα δαιμόνια καὶ), the words used here are καινοὺς θεοὺς. This fact alone

seems to show that when Plato uses the word *δαιμόνιον* as a substantive, he uses it as an alternative to *θεός*.

(b) *Apology* 24b: ἔχει δὲ πως ὧδε· Σωκράτη φησὶν ἀδικεῖν τοὺς τε νέους διαφθείροντα καὶ θεοὺς οὓς ἡ πόλις νομίζει οὐ νομίζοντα, ἕτερα δὲ δαιμόνια καὶνά.

Here again the context seems to show that *δαιμόνια* must be translated by 'deities'; and there is a further proof that *δαιμόνια* and *θεοί* are simply alternative words to express the same thing in *Apol.* 27a: Οὐτὸς γὰρ ἐμοὶ φαίνεται τὰ ἐναντία λέγειν αὐτὸς ἑαυτῷ ἐν τῇ γραφῇ ὥσπερ ἂν εἰ εἴποι. 'Ἀδικεῖ Σωκράτης θεοὺς οὐ νομίζων, ἀλλὰ θεοὺς νομίζων.' The substitution here of *θεοὺς* for *δαιμόνια* in the second term of the passage seems to show beyond all possibility of doubt that the two words are alternatives not less in Plato than in Xenophon.

(c) *Apol.* 40 a-b: ἡ γὰρ εἰωθυῖα μοι μαντικὴ ἢ τοῦ δαιμονίου ἐν μὲν τῷ πρόσθεν χρόνῳ παντὶ πάνυ πυκνὴ αἰετὴν καὶ πάνυ ἐπὶ σμικροῖς ἐναντιούμενη, εἴ τι μέλλοιμι μὴ ὀρθῶς πράξειν. νυνὶ δὲ ξυμβέβηκέ μοι, ἅπερ ὀράτε καὶ αὐτοὶ ταυτὶ ἃ γε δὴ οἰηθείη ἂν τις καὶ νομίζεσθαι ἔσχατα κακῶν εἶναι. ἐμοὶ δὲ οὔτε ἐξιώντι ἔωθεν οἴκοθεν ἡναντιώθη τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σημεῖον, οὔτε ἡνίκα ἀνέβαινον ἐπὶ τὸ δικαστήριον, οὔτε ἐν τῷ λόγῳ οὐδαμοῦ μέλλοντί τι ἔρεῖν. καίτοι ἐν ἄλλοις λόγοις πολλαχοῦ δὴ με ἐπέσχε λέγοντα μεταξύ.

Here again τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ σημεῖον is clearly an alternative expression for *μαντικὴ ἢ τοῦ δαιμονίου*, and it seems therefore equally clear that *δαιμόνιον* and *θεός* are used as alternatives. When, therefore, Plato uses the phrase τὸ δαιμόνιον as a substantive, it seems clear that in each instance he uses it as practically equivalent to *θεός*.

(d) *Theaet.* 151a: οὓς, ὅταν πάλιν ἔλθωσι δεόμενοι τῆς ἐμῆς συνουσίας καὶ θαυμαστὰ δρῶντες, ἐνίοις μὲν τὸ γιγνόμενον μοι δαιμόνιον ἀποκαλύψει ξυνεῖναι ἐνίοις δ' ἐᾷ. As immediately before (in *Theaet.* 150c) we find the words τὸ δὲ αἴτιον τούτου τόδε· μαριεύσθαι με ὁ θεὸς ἀναγκάζει, γεννᾶν δὲ ἀπεκάλυπεν, it once more seems probable that *δαιμόνιον* is used as an alternative for *θεός*.

The word *δαιμόνιον* is also used adjectivally in Plato in regard to the

claims of Socrates to special divine intervention. The most notable passage is in the *Apology* 31 c-d: ἴσως ἂν οὖν δόξειεν ἄτοπον εἶναι, ὅτι δὴ ἐγὼ ἰδίᾳ μὲν ταῦτα ξυμβουλευῶ περιῶν καὶ πολυπραγμονῶ δημοσίᾳ δὲ οὐ τολμῶ ἀναβαίνειν εἰς τὸ πλῆθος τὸ ὑμέτερον ξυμβουλευεῖν τῇ πόλει. τούτου δὲ αἴτιον ἔστιν ὃ ὑμεῖς ἐμοῦ πολλάκις ἀκηκόατε πολλάχου λέγοντος, ὅτι μοι θεῖόν τι καὶ δαιμόνιον γίγνεται φωνή, ὃ δὴ καὶ ἐν τῇ γραφῇ ἐπικωμῶδῶν Μέλητος ἐγράψατο. Here *δαιμόνιον* is clearly used as an adjective; but here also the word is used in direct juxtaposition to *θεῖον*, which would seem to show that just as in Plato τὸ δαιμόνιον is an alternative expression for *θεός*, so also the adjective *δαιμόνιον* is equivalent to *θεῖον*.

The word is also used as an adjective in *Alcib.* I. 103a: τούτου δὲ τὸ αἴτιον γέγονεν οὐκ ἀνθρώπειον, ἀλλὰ τι δαιμόνιον ἐναντίωμα (where *δαιμόνιον* clearly means 'divine' in contrast to 'human'); in *Euthyd.* 272e: ἀνισταμένου δέ μου ἐγένετο τὸ εἰωθὸς σημεῖον τὸ δαιμόνιον. πάλιν οὖν ἐκαθεζόμεν; in *Phdr.* 242b: τὸ δαιμόνιον τε καὶ τὸ εἰωθὸς σημεῖον μοι γίνεσθαι ἐγένετο; and in *Rep.* 496c: τὸ δ' ἡμέτερον οὐκ ἄξιον λέγειν, τὸ δαιμόνιον σημεῖον. In all these passages it seems clear that the adjective is equivalent to the English 'divine'; just as the word, when used as a substantive, whether in Plato or Xenophon, is best translated by the English 'deity' or 'divinity.'

Lastly, the word *δαίμων* is only used by Plato in connection with this phenomenon in the *Apology* 27b-e. Its use there is purely philological. Socrates begins by asking the question: Ἔστιν ὅστις ἀνθρώπων, ὃ Μέλητε, ἀνθρώπεια μὲν νομίζει πράγματ' εἶναι, ἀνθρώπους δὲ οὐ νομίζει; which Meletus is unable to deny. He then goes on to ask: ἔσθ' ὅστις δαιμόνια μὲν νομίζει πράγματ' εἶναι, δαίμονας δὲ οὐ νομίζει; which Meletus is equally unable to deny. He continues: εἰ δὲ δαιμόνια νομίζω, καὶ δαίμονας δήπου πολλὴ ἀνάγκη νομίζειν μέεσθαι, and thus proves triumphantly, by an argument which is based on etymology, that Meletus has falsely accused him of atheism. But it is clear that the word *δαίμων* is used in this passage solely because it happens

to be the original substantival form from which the adjective *δαιμόνιος* is derived, and for no other reason.

It is submitted, therefore, that the word *δαιμόνιον* when used in connection with Socrates' claim: (1) when used substantivally should be translated by the English word 'deity' (or 'divinity'); (2) when used adjectivally should be

translated by the adjective 'divine'; (3) clearly has not the same meaning as the word '*δαίμων*,' but was almost certainly the actual word used by Socrates himself in regard to the manifestations of a deity, of the exact nature of whom he was himself ignorant.

R. E. MACNAGHTEN.

29, Greycoat Gardens, Westminster.

ON SAPPHO'S ODE.

THE new ode of Sappho, published in No. X. of the Oxyrhyncus Papyri, and re-edited with interesting comments and emendations by Mr. J. M. Edmonds in the recent issue of the *Classical Review*, is unfortunately seriously defective owing to the condition of the papyrus, and it seems extremely improbable that any conjectural restoration can be successful in reproducing what the scribe wrote with any tolerable certainty. In one place the accuracy of the scribe himself may, I think, be challenged. In l. 6 the editors read:

ἀ γὰρ πόλυ περσκόπεισα
κάλλος ἀνθρώπων Ἑλένα.

They add that 'σκεδοῖσα has led to no satisfactory restoration.' But they seem to admit, and it is quite obvious, that *περσκόπεισα* itself cannot be accepted without serious misgiving. That Helen should be credited by the poetess with a large experience of manly beauty is almost beyond belief. Not only is the remark in questionable taste, in fact on the verge of banality; but even if Helen's correct judgment upon that qualification had been the point at issue, Paris was no Aesop, and could have stood the test well enough. Yet it must be admitted that the papyrus supports *περσκόπεισα* and nothing else. ΠΕΡCK is there beyond question. We have the assurance of photography. Did then the writer of the P. transmit an erroneous reading? This is possible and, I think, probable. At any rate, adopting this view, I suggest that Sappho herself in Fragment 93 *πέρροχος* affords us the means of restoring here the true sense:

ἀ γὰρ πόλυ περρόχευσα
κάλλος ἀνθρώπων.

'For she who far surpassed mortal beauty, Helen.' This has been for some 3000 years, from Homer down to Andrew Lang and Rudyard Kipling, the universal idea of Helen, and surely Sappho expresses it in this phrase as finely as any poet, either before or since. Let us see how Shakespeare has paid tribute to an ideal lady:

Then to Sylvia let us sing,
That Sylvia is excelling;
She excels each mortal thing
Upon the dull earth dwelling.

Here we have nearly the same phrasing as that I assign to Sappho, and a curiously close reproduction of the ἐπὶ γὰρ μέλαιναν in l. 2.

In l. 8 *νεῖμεν* seems better than *κρίννεν*. It is not so much a question of judgment as of sentiment.

L. 9: Possibly *τάχος* for τὸ πᾶν, marking that the destruction was in the near future, cf. Aesch. *Ag.* 944, *Eumen.* 124.

L. 11: οὐποτ' ἐμνάσθη is perhaps better. *Μᾶλλον* seems scarcely admissible here. The meaning it gives: 'She had no better memory of,' 'there was no improvement in her recollection of,' will not serve.

L. 12: There are wide possibilities of conjecture here. I suggest

οὐκὶ κατ' αἴσαν (οὐ τι).

L. 13:

Ὡρος· εὐκαμπτον γὰρ ἔφυσεν ἄτορ,
αἱ κέ τις κούφως τὸ νέον νοήσῃ·
τῷ δὲ νῦν Ἀνακτορίας τὸ μέμνα
οὐ παρεοίσας·

οἱ γὰρ ἔχει φρόναμα. Τῷ δὲ κ.τ.λ. 'So therefore do thou remember,' μέμνασο.

L. 20: Perhaps *στησιμάχεντας*. Apparently a review of troops is meant; but

both horse and foot would play a part in this. The preceding ἄρματα might refer to fashionable spectators. Herodotus mentions Lydian cavalry, but not war-chariots.

I suggest for the last stanza:

εὖ δὲ Φίδμεν οὐ δύνατον γένεσθαι
ὄλβον ἀνθρώποις· πεδέχην δ' ἄρασθαι
ἐλπιδ' ἐς φαίδραν ἄγαγ' ὠφέλησεν
τ' ἐξ ἁδοκήτω.

Cf. Hom. Od. iii. 208:

ἀλλ' οὐ μοι τοιοῦτον ἐπέκλωσαν θεοὶ
ὄλβον.

P.S.—I see that Dr. A. S. Hunt, writing in the June issue on the possible readings of the papyrus, objects to Mr. Edmonds's οὐδέ in l. 15 because 'δ is quite improbable.' Obviously my

τῷ δέ is open to the same objection. May I suggest as not inconsistent with the appearances on the papyrus?

ἀλλὰ νῦν Ἀνακτορίας τὸ μέμνα-
σ' οὐ παρεόσας.

In l. 14 the objection to τις is perhaps not quite so well founded. There is little decisive guidance.

Marks of an indefinite hiatus should probably be placed before the concluding stanza.

L. 19 f. The words of Cowley, 'the spectators made up—no small part of the spectacle itself,' in his description of the funeral of Oliver Cromwell, convey the same idea.

T. L. AGAR.

11, Clyde Road, West Didsbury, Manchester.

THE BRIGHT ALDEBARAN.

DANIEL BOONE, or any squirrel hunter of Kentucky, could doubtless have solved the difficulties of Euripides, *I. A.* 7-8, for the philologists, even if he were so untutored as to be unable to call the star by name, for he would be able at least to point out the σείριος ἀστήρ near the Pleiades. And he would also know what the philologists (usually snug in bed at this time) do not seem to have known—that hours, apparently, elapse from the time the hunter begins his watch until the glorious orb of day rises above the horizon. No sound of birds is yet heard; no squirrel comes leaping over the branches of the forest to the feeding tree. The gloom of darkness prevails on earth; but the first streak of dawn has appeared in the east, and the sky gradually becomes brighter. Soon the lesser lights, and the constellation of the Pleiades itself, are extinguished. The σείριος Aldebaran alone remains twinkling in this part of the heavens. It is just at this time that Agamemnon emerges from his tent in haste. Nearly ten minutes later the fire of Helios begins to burn, and changes the azure of the sky to white: λευκαίνει | τόδε φῶς ἤδη λάμπουσ' ἡὼς | πῦρ τε τεθρίππων τῶν Ἀελίου (156-58). 'This light' is not the torch in Aga-

memnon's hand, as some think, but the light in the sky (τόδε φῶς in contradistinction to the σκότος which still remains on earth); and this light has obscured almost all the stars. Now if the sky, as seen from the eastern edge of a woodland pasture in Kentucky, is lit up so long before the sun appears, how much longer must the heaven have been bright at Aulis before the sun showed his face above Mount Olympus in Euboea? Yet only a few minutes pass before Agamemnon observes that the chariot of the sun is making its appearance. A glimpse of the famous morning scene in *Chantecler* would correct any false impressions one might have concerning the approach of ῥοδοδάκτυλος Ἥως.

Hermann thinks 'verba ἔτι μεσσήρης non ita premenda videri,' and Klotz adds 'ne illa quidem verba ἐγγὺς . . . Πλειάδος premenda videri.' But it is certainly extremely unlikely that an intelligent and educated Greek, who gazed at the stars ἐν αἰθέρος κύκλῳ much more frequently than those who are accustomed to gaze rather at the stars ἐν κύκλῳ δολλαρίου, could have made such a blunder as to transfer Sirius from the eastern sky to the zenith near the Pleiades. Even more improb-

able is the assumption of Boeckh (and many others) that Sirius is on the western horizon. And Klotz's own interpretation (*mediam noctem esse*) seems to me to be the most unlikely of all.

It has been assumed by scholars that both the Dog Star and the Pleiades are visible. My contention is that neither is visible. Commentators do not seem to have attached sufficient importance to *ποτ' ἄρ'* and to *πορθμεύει*. To ask *τίς ποτ' ἄρ' ἀστὴρ ὅδε* were a silly question, if the star were easy, under the circumstances, to locate, that is, in its relation to the other stars. If Agamemnon saw Sirius, when all the other stars were shining, he recognized it; and it would have been unnecessary for another to explain to him *ἑγγὺς τῆς Πλειάδος*—which after all is not true, so far as the Dog Star is concerned. And *πορθμεύει* evidently refers to some bright bark crossing the ferry of the empyrean sea. 'The dawn in russet mantle clad walks o'er the dew of yon high eastern hill' (159). But the bright star which has attracted Agamemnon's gaze is still twinkling (*ἄσσων ἔτι μεσσήρης*). The light of the morn has dimmed all the other candles in the sky. Hence Agamemnon is unable to determine precisely which one this particular *ἀστὴρ* is, that still palpitates in broad daylight. The old man knows, because he has been observing the sky for some time. But the commander-in-chief has just come from his tent, and in great haste (*αἰσσεις*, 11). The Pleiades are no longer visible. As he looks toward the east and then lifts his eyes toward the zenith, his attention is naturally

attracted to the *ἀίσων* Aldebaran (the tents certainly faced the Euripus): no sound of birds is heard—*οὔτε θαλάσσης*—and no sign of winds, for which the Greeks have looked in vain so long, appears on the Euripus. The deictic *τόνδε* indicates that Agamemnon is looking in the direction of Euboea. The form *αἰσσων* of our MSS. is possibly due to *αἰσσεις* just below.

There can be no question but that the Greeks used *σεῖριος* to designate any bright star, cf. Theon Smyrn. *De astron.* 16, *κοινῶς τε γάρ, φησὶν ὁ Ἄδραστος, πάντας τοὺς ἀστέρας οἱ ποιηταὶ σειρίους καλοῦσιν*. If, now, the poet refers to Aldebaran as "a *σεῖριος ἑγγὺς τῆς Πλειάδος*," Hermann's *ἐξῆς* for *ἑγγύς*, Musgrave's *Πτωκάδος* for *Πλειάδος*, Vater's *αἰσῶν* for *ἄσσων*, and Weil's *Αἰθῶν*, are all unnecessary.

The participle *ἄσσων* refers to the throbbing of the star. Cf. Plato, *Symposium* 215 E *ἡ καρδία πηδᾷ*, Eur. *Hippocles* 1353 *πηδᾷ σφάκελος*, *Bacch.* 1289 *καρδία πήδημ' ἔχει*, Plut. 2.83 B, Hippoc. 1221 B *πηδηθμός* (*pulsation*), Theophr. *Ign.* 69 *πήδησις* (of wood burning). The throbbing veins were called *τὰ σφύζοντα* (Plato, *Phaedr.* 251 D); and *ἄσσων* is here equivalent to *σφύζων*.

Aldebaran goes *μεσοπόρου δι' αἰθέρος* (*Ion* 1152) along the *ἐπταπόρου δρόμῃμα Πελειάδος* (*Or.* 1005). It is one of the conspicuous *ἄστρ' ἐν αἰθέρος κύκλῳ* (*Ion* 1147), in altisono Caeli clipeo, and Agamemnon is simply wondering *τίς ἀστὴρ ἄσσων ἔτι μεσσήρης*, in spite of the fact that the whole vault of heaven toward the east is 'whitened' with the light of the approaching sun.

J. E. HARRY.

University of Cincinnati.

DR. J. B. MAYOR ON THE USE OF ENI AND ENEΣΤΙ, AND AITEIN AND AITEΙΣΘΑΙ, IN THE NEW TESTAMENT.

DR. J. B. MAYOR discusses these points in the *Expositor* for April 1912 p. 380 *sqq.*, and June 1912 p. 522 *sqq.* In Galatians iii. 26-28 *οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖος οὐδὲ Ἕλλην . . . πάντες γὰρ ὑμεῖς εἰς ἔστε ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*, he explains (differing from Lightfoot, who comments, 'there is no room for, no place for') thus:

'In the body of Christ distinctions disappear: Jew is not, Greek is not.' 'What more is needed? If we will go out of our way to introduce the idea of impossibility, we must change the personal to the impersonal construction: *οὐκ ἔνι Ἰουδαῖον εἶναι οὐδὲ Ἕλληνα τὸν ἐν Χριστῷ Ἰησοῦ*. So 1 Cor. vi. 5,

οὕτως οὐκ ἐνὶ ἐν ὑμῖν οὐδεὶς σοφός; In James i. 17 παρ' ᾧ οὐκ ἐνὶ παραλλαγῇ, ἐνὶ is to be taken in the same way. In the following places ἐνεστί has the literal meaning: Thuc. I. 80, ἐνεσται χρόνος, not 'time will be necessary,' but 'there will be an interval of time' (admitted by Sheppard and Evans and apparently Classen); Plato, *Phaedo* 77E, ἕως ἐνὶ τις καὶ ἐν ἡμῖν παῖς (where Dr. Hort has seen 'a playful irony': 'perhaps it is not impossible that'; but where Themistius, *Or.* I. 13, takes the literal sense); Soph. *El.* 527, τῶνδ' ἄρνησις οὐκ ἐνεστί μοι, et alibi. The view taken in these passages appears sound.

But the conclusions about the use of αἰτεῖν and αἰτεῖσθαι are more disputable.

He discusses James iv. 2, 3, οὐκ ἔχετε διὰ τὸ μὴ αἰτεῖσθαι ὑμᾶς· αἰτεῖτε καὶ οὐ λαμβάνετε, διότι κακῶς αἰτεῖσθε, ἵνα ἐν ταῖς ἡδοναῖς ὑμῶν δαπανήσητε. Refuting Dr. Hort (who on this passage says that αἰτεῖν is properly to ask a person, what is asked for being often added in a second accusative; and that αἰτεῖσθαι is properly to ask for a thing; the person asked is sometimes also inserted, but rarely), Dr. Mayor points out that this distinction is not in accordance either with the usage of N.T. (Luke i. 63 αἰτήσας πινακίδιον, Acts xvi. 29 αἰτήσας φῶτα) or of profane Greek; it is counter to the dictum of Favorinus ap. Sturz, *Lexic. Xenoph.* s.v. αἰτοῦμαι· τὸ μετὰ παρακλήσεως αἰτῶ καὶ ἱκετεύω, and to Schol. on Ar. Plut. 156, αἰτῶ τὸ ἀπλῶς ζητῶ, τὸ δὲ αἰτοῦμαι τὸ μεθ' ἱκεσίας.

But he proceeds to argue that in this passage of St. James αἰτῶ means 'prayer of the lips, as contrasted with prayer of the heart' (αἰτεῖσθαι); he illustrates it by Mark vi. 22, 25. 'Herod's thoughtless promise to the daughter of Herodias is expressed by the words αἰτησόν με ὃ ἐὰν θέλῃς; but the daughter of Herodias consults her mother v. 24 τί αἰτήσωμαι; and v. 25 εἰσελθούσα εὐθὺς μετὰ σπουδῆς πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα ᾗτήσατο.' So in Matthew xx. 20-22 = Mark x. 35-38 Salome requests for her sons, αἰτοῦσά τι παρ' αὐτοῦ, but Christ replies, οὐκ οἴδατε τί αἰτεῖσθε, giving the true meaning of the request.

But the force of the instance in Mark vi. is weakened by the parallel Matthew xiv. 7, where Herod ὡμολό-

γησεν αὐτῇ δοῦναι ἃ ἐὰν αἰτήσῃται, and conversely, though Mark xi. 24 ὅσα ἂν προσευχόμενοι αἰτεῖσθε may be advanced by him, = Matthew xxi. 22 ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῇ προσευχῇ πιστεύοντες, where the heart is implied: though Dr. M. might say that πιστ. makes the middle unnecessary.

Again, he argues thus. John xvi. 24, 26 has ᾗτήσατε οὐδὲν ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου (the prayers of the disciples before the outpouring of the Spirit), but ἐν ἐκείνῃ τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου αἰτήσεσθε (the prayers which should follow the outpouring). I John v. 14, ἐάν τι αἰτῶμεθα κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ, ἀκούει ἡμῶν, καὶ ἐὰν οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἀκούει ἡμῶν ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεθα, οἶδαμεν ὅτι ἔχομεν τὰ αἰτήματα ἃ ᾗτήκαμεν ἀπ' αὐτοῦ. 'The general sense seems to be, "If we pray in spirit and in truth according to His will, we know that we have the object of our petitions."' "

But does the general usage in St. John bear this out? Surely the following passages in which the active is used imply prayer of the heart: John xiv. 13 ὃ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, xv. 16 ὃ τι ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, xvi. 23 ὅσα ἂν αἰτήσητε τὸν πατέρα ἐν τῷ ὀνόματί μου, I John iii. 22 ὃ ἐὰν αἰτῶμεν λαμβάνομεν παρ' αὐτοῦ. And αἰτεῖτε καὶ δοθήσεται Matthew vii. 7 (the active five times in this passage, and five times in = Luke xi. 9).

In fact, the meanings of the active and middle appear to be identical, and no certain conclusions can be drawn from the instances in the LXX. Further, the Indexes to the classical prose and verse writers point, as often in the case of constructions, rather to a historical change of usage than to a difference in meaning. Thus in Aeschylus the middle preponderates over the active, and to some extent in Sophocles; in Herodotus, Thucydides, and Euripides the instances are about equal; in Aristophanes in the more dignified passages the middle predominates; in Lysias and Andocides the middle, but in the later Attic of Plato and Demosthenes, the active: in Xenophon they are about equal. In set phrases, such as δίκας, λόγον, μισθόν (Hdt. Plat.), the active is used, just as with St. John's

ἐν τῷ ὀνόματι; but with adjectives and pronouns, the middle. Lastly, the Rev. L. Pullan points out to me that St. Luke in the Acts prefers the middle, and apparently in part of his Gospel (ch. xxiii.); but in the middle

section of his Gospel, which is largely based upon another document, the active. Beyond this it does not seem safe to go.

J. U. POWELL.

PORTUS ITIUS.¹

I HAVE been abroad for eight weeks. Returning to London towards the end of June, I saw for the first time F. H.'s second article. My object is not to make points against him, but to throw more light upon the question.

1. Whatever F. H. thinks of the evidence adduced by Desbrière, he will admit that Napoleon's officers were never able to get more than 100 ships out of Boulogne Harbour in one tide, that except in the narrow space formed by the channel of the Liane the ships were generally aground, and that not only lack of room but also the force of the tidal current was a serious obstacle.² F. H. says that 'in any case this evidence yields only probabilities.' I never contended that it yielded more. But since Caesar had to get at least 600-650 ships out of Portus Itius, not merely in one tide but in two hours or less, or else to start from the roadstead outside the harbour, the probabilities can hardly be ignored.

2. F. H. affirms that 'no ground exists for alleging that the other 150 or 200 trading ships'—the ships which *sui quisque commodi causa fecerat*—'all started from . . . any particular spot.' It seems to me that two grounds exist for supposing that they started from Portus Itius. First, if they started from any other port, they and their owners needed special protection; and since Caesar allowed the owners to accompany him, if he had forbidden them to start from Portus Itius, he would surely have detached troops to protect them. Secondly, the 'trading ships,' the transports, and the galleys were all visible off the British

coast at the same time.³ Is it not probable that they all started from the same port? At all events no ground exists for alleging that the 'trading ships' started from a port other than Portus Itius. Nevertheless, I will make F. H. a present of them.

3. The 'nautical opinion' did not mean 'that the ships could be got out with a depth and extent of water which might reasonably be assumed': it meant that they might have been got out with the depth and extent of water which Desjardins postulated. Desjardins's plan⁴ represents the mouth of the harbour as about 530 yards wide. Probably it was; but one may doubt whether at the time when the ships began to move—about four hours before high water⁵—it was deep enough near the sides to float them.⁶ The sides of estuaries which have not been artificially improved are dry at low water. The 'nautical opinion' was based on the hypothesis that the ships did not start from the wharves, but that, after leaving the wharves, they were anchored in parallel rows in the estuary, and were ready *ad solis occasum*

³ *B.G.*, v. 8, 6.

⁴ *Géogr. de la Gaule rom.*, vol. i., pl. xv. and xvii.

⁵ *Ancient Britain*, pp. 729-30. In *Ancient Britain* (p. 576, n. 1) I was obliged to assume that *ad solis occasum* meant about 7 p.m.,—an hour before sunset; otherwise there would hardly have been time for the ships to get from Boulogne to the point which they reached at dawn. The assumption was, I think, permissible; if not, the case for Boulogne is weakened.

⁶ In the Bronze Age the bed of the estuary in the 'ancien bassin,' which in the Stone Age had been considerably deeper, was 8 m. 24 (about 27 feet) below the level of high water at spring tides. See *Boulogne-sur-mer et la région boulonnaise*, i., 1899, pp. 23-4, and cf. Desjardins, i. 380. But at Boulogne the range of spring tides is 25½ feet (*The Channel Pilot*, Part ii., 1906, p. 559).

¹ *Classical Review*, December, 1913; March and May, 1914.

² E. Desbrière, *Projets et tentatives*, etc., iii. 144, 147-8, 451, 566; iv. 145, 395, 398.

to start in the order which would have enabled the rowers to clear the harbour in the shortest possible time. To assume that when they were about to start they were at anchor strains the words *naves soluit*. It is permissible to suppose that the ships started from the wharves, where the troops had embarked, close to the camp. Of the whole fleet about 540 transports and 28 galleys could be rowed.¹ If they had been drawn up in single file, 570, placed end to end in actual contact, would have formed a line nearly 7 miles long.² Therefore, if Portus Itius was Boulogne, we must suppose that they were massed, like Napoleon's ships, alongside the wharves in contiguous rows, say eight or nine deep;³ or, if there were two camps, one on either side of the harbour, four or five deep. The harbour-master of Dover believes that they could not have been rowed out against the tide at the rate of more than two miles an hour.⁴ I have calculated that with perfect organization and supposing that the rowers had worked with machine-like precision, that the current had not interfered with steering, and that there was room for ten ships to move out abreast, the ships might have cleared the harbour in four hours, or, if they started simultaneously from wharves on either side, in two.⁵ Perhaps, if they had been formed side by side perpendicularly to the wharves, the time might have been reduced; but I am not sure that in this case they would not have been unduly crowded.

¹ *B.G.*, v. 2, 2; 5, 2.

² The transports could hardly have been smaller than Napoleon's smallest vessels, which were 60 feet long. See *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, p. 436, n. 6, and *B.G.*, v. 23, 5.

³ See the plan in Desbrière's fourth vol., p. 400.

⁴ So he told me in 1911.

⁵ The best plan would have been this. Suppose that the ships in the column furthest from the wharf, reckoned from the ship nearest the mouth of the harbour, were numbered 1, 2, 3, . . . The crews of 10, 20, 30, etc., would have simultaneously cast off the hawsers, and begun to row diagonally across the stream. At the right moment 9, 19, 29, etc., would have followed suit. Thus ultimately 10, 9, 8 . . . 1 would have been rowing abreast, followed by 20, 19, 18, etc. Then the next column would have begun to move, and so on. Remember that the current was of course strongest in mid-

But the ships that could be rowed were not the whole fleet. Neither the 'nautical opinion' nor the calculation which I have just mentioned took account of the larger ships which Caesar had used in the previous year. Most of these ships, however, were used again in 54 B.C.⁶ They could not have cleared the harbour along with the others: they must have started either before or after;⁷ and, if they had started from the wharves, to get them out under sail would have taken a long time. 'The small fleet—eighty transports and a few galleys—which sailed from Boulogne in 55 B.C. was inconveniently strung out.'⁸ If the whole fleet started in the order required by the 'nautical opinion,' it may have cleared the estuary in two hours; but one must not forget what Napoleon's harbour-master said about the tide: 'La vitesse est telle pendant près de deux heures dans les grandes marées, que l'art et la précaution de la manœuvre ne peuvent en triompher.'⁹ It is true that the period during which the tide flowed at this speed did not begin till about two hours and a half before high water; but while it lasted Napoleon's officers could not get their ships out at all. Some may be inclined to suppose that Caesar's ships, having cleared the harbour in the course of the day, started *ad solis occasum* from the roadstead; but this assumption also strains the meaning of *naves soluit*. Perhaps the words will bear the strain;¹⁰ but the difficulty must be faced.

4. I of course admit that, as F. H. says, 'it is doubtful whether' the Earl of Leicester 'originally sailed from Wissant with a very large force.'

5. F. H. says that 'on any ordinary calculation the supply [of water] mentioned by Mr. Holmes would not have sufficed for the animals alone, even if—as is impossible—not a drop had been

stream, and that there are eddies at the mouth of the harbour.

⁶ *B.G.*, v. 1, 1.

⁷ Probably after; for their draught was greater, and when the transports had gone there would have been more water.

⁸ Cf. *B.G.*, iv. 23, 2 with § 4.

⁹ Desbrière, iii. 144.

¹⁰ See *Caesar's Conquest of Gaul*, 1911, pp. 436, 438.

wasted.' In the Crimean War 'every gallon of water that the spring gave was made available.' If F. H. will consult *The Soldier's Pocket-Book*,¹ he will see how simple was the well-known contrivance by which this result was attained. He will be quite safe if he accepts the calculation of Lord Wolseley,—that a horse 'requires from six to eight gallons per diem' and a mule six gallons.² Besides the 4,000 cavalry horses, there were, according to the usual estimate, 4,000-4,800 beasts of burden, and, let us say, 1,000 cavalry remounts. I will suppose that 10,000 horses and mules had to be provided for. They would have required 60,000 gallons a day. My informant, speaking with authority, stated that there were 'entr'autres trois sources extrêmement abondantes.' He gave the daily yield of two of the three,—80,000 + 200,000-300,000 litres. Taking the mean between the two latter figures, we get a total of 330,000 litres, or 73,260 gallons. This would have provided for the animals and have left for the men about 13,000 gallons, *plus* the supply yielded by the other springs, one of which is 'extrêmement abondante.' F. H. reckons that there were 39,000 men to be provided for, besides the crews and 'a miscellaneous host of camp-followers,' whose numbers he will not conjecture. The crews, except those of the twenty-eight galleys, did not include rowers; for the transports were rowed by soldiers.³ Let us suppose that the crews numbered 3,000.⁴ The 'camp-followers' were the *mercatores*, who followed the army in order to trade with it, and were not allowed to sleep inside the camp, and the *calones*,—slaves who performed menial duties and drivers. We may be sure that Caesar kept the number of the former within bounds, and that of the latter he employed no more than were necessary. I can discover only one indication of their relative numbers under the Republic. It will be found in *Bell. Civ.*, iii. 2, 2, compared with 6, 1-2. In the former passage Caesar says that

when he reached Brundisium in the autumn of 49 B.C. he found only enough ships to carry 15,000 legionaries and 600 cavalry. In 6, 1-2 he says that he urged the men, who cheerfully consented, to leave behind the slaves and heavy baggage (*mancipia atque impedimenta*), in order to provide room for more troops, and that he sailed with seven legions [and 600 cavalry]. The seven legions amounted, as Stoffel⁵ calculates, to about 20,000 men. We may infer that the slaves and baggage—that is, all the baggage that could be dispensed with—of 15,000 legionaries and 600 cavalry took up as much room as 5,000 legionaries. The *impedimenta* presumably included the beasts that would have carried the superfluous baggage. The slaves therefore evidently numbered less than 5,000; and if I assume that there were 12,000 'camp-followers' at Portus Itius, I shall perhaps be making an excessive estimate. In the field every man requires six pints of water a day for drinking and cooking, and, as Lord Wolseley says, 'a similar amount will just allow men to wash their bodies.'⁶ Thus 54,000 men would have required 81,000 gallons. Though the third 'abundant' spring and the others would probably not have supplied the needful amount, there were other sources,—the river Slacq, which was not more than four miles from any spot where the army would have encamped near Wissant, and its tributary, the Bazinghen, which was rather nearer. The animals needed exercise and could well have been taken thither to water, leaving the springs for the men.⁷ 'It is a good plan,' says Lord Wolseley, 'to water when about one or two miles from camp, and then to walk the horses slowly to their lines for the night: always give lake or river water [to animals] in preference to that from springs or wells.'⁸ Even at Boulogne it would have been necessary to go some miles up the Liane for fresh water, un-

¹ Fifth ed., 1886, p. 258.

² *The Soldier's Pocket-Book*, 1886, pp. 73, 77.

³ *B.G.*, v. 8, 4.

⁴ The author of the 'nautical opinion' owns a ketch, 57 feet long, which he sails with the help of two men.

⁵ *Hist. de Jules César*, ii. 323.

⁶ *The Soldier's Pocket-Book*, p. 95.

⁷ At Alexandria Caesar sunk wells with satisfactory results (*Bell. Alex.*, 8, 1; 9, 1-2); but to do so at Wissant would have been unnecessary.

⁸ *The Soldier's Pocket-Book*, p. 73.

less springs yielded enough, for in the estuary the water was of course brackish.

F. H. tells me that I 'observed (*Ancient Britain*, p. 583) that Caesar's forces could not possibly have been fed at Wissant.' Neither on p. 583 nor anywhere else. What I said (on p. 584) was that 'to transport [food] to Wissant without roads would have been a task of extreme difficulty,'—for wagons. As I did not then realise that Caesar may have thought it advisable to discard Boulogne in 54 B.C., lest he should be unable to clear the estuary in a reasonable time, I naturally argued that he would have preferred the port which was connected with the interior by roads to one which, as far as we know, was not. But, if he desired to avoid the difficulties of extricating his huge fleet from the estuary, it was not difficult to transport grain to Wissant on pack-horses; and, as I now know, if the ground is firm, even wagons can be drawn by oxen where there are no roads.¹ It must not be forgotten that Caesar did not intend to stay long at Portus Itius: the north-westerly winds which delayed him for twenty-five days were unexpected and unusual.

I have only tried to show that the case for Boulogne cannot be regarded as conclusively proved. There is reason, I repeat, to believe that between Cape Griz-Nez and Cape Blanc-Nez the ships

which were constructed with a view to their being easily hauled up on shore could have remained above the high-water mark of spring tides, while the older vessels might have ridden in the anchorage which is protected against northerly and north-westerly winds by a sandbank, and against south-westerly winds, to some extent, by Cape Griz-Nez;² it was possible to feed the troops; and there was enough water. I think therefore that F. H. exaggerates when he says that 'the evidence is dead against Wissant'; and I hope to convince him that the weakness, or the element of doubt, which I have discovered in the case for Boulogne is not imaginary.

T. RICE HOLMES.

[By the courtesy of the editors I have seen a proof of the above. Plainly, the controversy, if it is not to swallow the whole *Classical Review*, must stop here, before its multitudes of 'ifs' get thicker. I will say only, as to water at Wissant, that I took expert military counsel before I wrote, and that Mr. Holmes seems to have minimised his men and beasts and their needs beyond due measure, and yet not to have enough water. For the rest, I must console myself that, if I am not on the same side as Mr. Holmes, I am on the side of M. Jullian.—F. H.]

² Cf. Desbrière, iii. 162, with *Geol. Mag.*, 1866, pp. 113-4.

¹ *The Soldier's Pocket-Book*, p. 78.

NOTES

PISIDIAN STELAE.

[NOTE.—Professor Sayce sent me the following notes in the winter of 1905-6; but the paper was lost among numbers of similar unfinished articles of much greater length, and I found it again only in the end of February, 1914. The inscriptions present several points of interest, on which the notes are partly Professor Sayce's and partly mine.—W. M. RAMSAY.]

In the spring of 1905 I copied some interesting inscriptions on stelae from

Pisidia and Lycia, which are in the Museum at Constantinople. They were unnumbered, and, so far as I can learn, are still unpublished. The letters are painted under figures of warriors in Greek dress, which are also painted on the stone.

I.

ΠΙΝΑΡΕΩΝ ΤΟ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΥΜΑ
ΚΑΡΤΑΔΙΝΕΡΜΑ ΚΤΙΒΙΛΙΟΤ
ΜΝΙΟΝ ΧΡΗΣΤΕ ΚΑΙ ΑΛΤΙΠΕΧΑΙΡΕ

Πινάρéων τὸ πολίτευμα,
Καρταδινερμα Κτιβίλου
μν[ε]ῖον· χρηστὲ καὶ ἄλυπε, χαῖρε.

'The governing body of Pinara: a memorial to Kartadinermas, son of Ktibilos: farewell in painless happiness!'

My division of the two proper names is of course conjectural; but both must be genitive (or the first dative).

With Ktibilos compare Kutbelemis, and Ktouboldos (Sundwall, *die einheim. Namen der Lykier*, p. 117; also the Isaurian name $\chi\upsilon\tau$ in an unpublished inscription).

Πολίτευμα is noteworthy here: the sense is unusual. In the great inscription of Rhodiapolis (Benndorf-Niemann, II. pp. 80-115), πολίτευμα is used twice in the sense, 'performance of the duties of a citizen.' So also in the Tarsian Paul's letter to the Philippians, II. 20. Here it seems to denote 'the body of the πολίται,' i.e. the assembly.

2.

ΣΑΛΜΑΜΟ . . . ΔΑΔΕ . .

. . .

Σ[?]αλμαμό[ας 'Α]δαδέ[υς].
[χαίρε.]

'Salmamoas of Adada, farewell!'

The element -μαμο is common in Pisidian names—Μαμόας, Μαμότασις, Μάμαστις, etc. Salma + Moas is probably the best way of dividing the name into elements.

3.

ΔΙΟΣΚΤΡΙΔΗΞΑΒΟΟΤ ΠΙΣΙΔΗ
ΒΑΡΒΟΤΛΕΤΣΤΜΜΑΧΩΝ
ΣΗΜΕΟΦΟΡΕΧΡΗΣΤΕ
ΧΑΙΡΕ
ΚΕΡΑΙΑΣ Ο ΑΔΕΛΦΟΣ ΕΣΤΗΣΕ

Διοσκ[ο]υρίδη ἔξ 'Αβόου Πισιδῆ
Βαρβουλεῦ συμμαχῶν
σημε[ι]οφόρε, χρηστὲ
χαίρε.

Κεραίας ὁ ἀδελφός ἔστησε.

'Ο Dioskourides, standard-bearer of the auxiliaries, from Aboos Pisidian of Barboula, farewell in happiness! His brother Keraias has erected (this).'

Balboursa was one of the cities of the Cibyritic Tetrapolis. The transposition of *r* and *l* is in accordance with many examples. σύμμαχοι are to be understood as mercenary soldiers serving

under a foreign flag. Old Lycian soldiers formed part of the population of the Seleucid city Apollonia, in Pisidian Phrygia (Pisidia later). Aboos was perhaps a village of the territory of Balboursa: compare Abokome Lycaniae and the personal name Aba.

With the personal name Κεραίας we must connect the ethnic Κεραειτῶν, a people united on coins with the people of Cremna. Compare the town-name Kadooi, Κάδοι, ethnic Καδοηνός (*Hist. Geogr.*), Kidramoas and Kidramos, Pappas and Pappa, etc.

4.

ΣΑΕΤΤΑΣ ΤΡΟΚΟΝΔΟΥ ΤΕΡΜΗΣ
ΣΕΟΝΤΟΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΟΙΝΟΑΝΔΟΙΣ
ΠΙΔΗΣ ΣΥΜΜΑΧΟΣ ΤΕΡΜΗΣ ΣΕΩ
ΝΤΩΝ ΠΡΟΣ ΟΙΝΟΑΝΔΟΙΣ ΠΙΣΙΔΩΝ
ΤΟ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΥΜΑ ΤΟΝ ΕΑΥΤΩΝ ΠΟΛΕ
ΙΤΗΝ ΧΡΗΣΤΕ ΧΑΙΡΕ

Σαέττας Τροκόνδου Τερμησ
σέ[ω]ν τ[ῶ]ν πρὸς 'Οινοάνδοις
Πι[σι]δῆς σύμμαχος Τερμησσέω
ν τῶν πρὸς 'Οινοάνδοις Πισιδῶν,
τό πολίτευμα τὸν ἑαυτῶν πολε
ίτην· χρηστὲ, χαίρε.

'Saettas, son of Trokondas, auxiliary, of the Termessians near Oenoanda, a Pisidian: the governing body of Termessos near Oenoanda, Pisidians, to their citizen: happy one, farewell!'

Trokondas, contracted probably from Trokondêmos, is a well known South-Asianic name, compounded with that of the god Tarkus.

Saettas, compare the city-name Saittai of Lydia; see note above on Keraias.

A. H. SAYCE.

ΑΥΞΑΝΙΟΣ.

THIS word occurs in an interesting metrical inscription on a gladiator which Messrs. Ormerod and Robinson have just published in the *Journal of Hellenic Studies*, vol. 34, p. 18 ('Inscriptions from Lycia,' No. 26). This gladiator, a *secutor* called Victor, ὃν πάντες τρώμεον σύνζυγοι ἐν σταδίοις (cf. Mart. V. 24. 4, 5 'Hermes turba sui tremorque ludī, | Hermes quem timet Helius sed unum'), was a native of

Libya who died in Lycia, in the words of the epitaph,

οὗ πατρὶς ἦν Λιβύη νῦν δὲ Ξάνθοιό με
γαῖα,
αὐξάνιον δάπεδον, κατέ(χ)ει σὺν δόγματι
Μοιρ(ῶ)ν.

αὐξάνιον, which the editors give up, is a compound from *αὐξι-άνια*, like *αὐξίβιος*, *αὐξίτροφος* Orph. H. 9 (10). 17, 50 (51). 12, *Αὐξιτύχη* (a remodelled formation from an earlier *ἀεξι-, ἀεξι-τροφος* Orph. H. 50 (51). 17, *ἀεξίγυις* Pind., *ἀεξίκακος*, *ἀεξίνοος*, *ἀεξίτοκος*, *ἀεξίφυλλος*, etc.) on the one hand, and like *Λυσ-ανίας* cf. Ar. Nub. 1162 *λυσανίας πατρώων μεγάλων κακῶν*, *Λυσ-αγόρας* etc. by *λυσί-προνος* etc. on the other. The thought in *dolorem augens solum* hardly needs illustration; the

bitter lament of Catullus will no doubt occur to many, 68. 97 sqq. 'quem nunc tam longe non inter nota sepulcra | nec prope cognatos compositum cineres | sed Troia obsцена, Troia infelice sepultum | detinet (*κατέχει*) extremo terra aliena solo.'

The editors are undoubtedly right in understanding *σύζυγοι* of the adversaries with whom Victor was drawn to fight. So *compares* in Lactantius *Inst.* VI. 20. 13 'irascuntur etiam pugnantibus nisi celeriter e duobus alter occisus est et, tamquam humanum sanguinem sitiant, oderunt moras; alios illis *compares* dari poscunt recentiores ut quam primum oculos suos satient.'

J. P. POSTGATE.

Liverpool,
July 13, 1914.

REVIEWS

GRAECO-ROMAN EGYPT.

De Magistratibus Aegyptiis externas Lagidarum Regni Provincias administrantibus. Scripsit D. COHEN. 8vo. Pp. xii + 114. 's Gravenhage: L. Levisson, n.d. Hfl. 4.50 (M. 8, Frs. 9.50).

Quaestiones Epiphaniae metrologicae et criticae. Scripsit OSCARIUS VIEDEBANTT. 8vo. Pp. x. + 140. 1 plate and tables. Lipsiae: B. G. Teubner, 1911. M. 6.

Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer. Von DR. JUR. MARIANO SAN NICOLÒ. Ier Band. 8vo. Pp. 225. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913.

Der Fiskus der Ptolemäer: I. Seine Spezialbeamten und sein öffentlich rechtlicher Charakter. Von DR. JUR. ALFONS STEINER. 8vo. Pp. 66. Leipzig, Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1913. Unbound, M. 2.40; bound, M. 3.60.

Ptolemäisches Prozessrecht: Studien zur ptolemäischen Gerichtsverfassung und zum Gerichtsverfahren. Heft I. Von DR. JUR. GREGOR SEMEKA. 8vo. Pp. v + 311. München: C. H. Beck'sche Verlagsbuchhandlung, 1913.

THE first of the above books relates not to Egypt itself, but to the Egyptian empire, and the second concerns papyrology incidentally only. Dr. Cohen's volume had its origin, as he explains in his preface, in a scheme for a history of the Roman province of Judaea. He considered it advisable first to determine the manner of its government in pre-Roman times; and since trustworthy material for the administrative history of Judaea itself is almost entirely wanting, his plan is to reach a conclusion by inference from the state of affairs in the other provinces of the Lagid and Seleucid empires. The present volume is devoted to the former. The literary material is, as he points out, of little use for the details of administration, owing to the vagueness of the phraseology employed by historians, and, with the exception of P. Tebt. I. 8, it is not here, as in the case of Egypt, supplemented by papyri. The evidence is therefore derived almost entirely from inscriptions, which are themselves not over numerous, and whose testimony is often ambiguous. The author traverses the ground very

carefully, and his collection of the evidence from many sources, with his detailed discussion, will be useful; but though he establishes some facts of importance, it must be confessed that as a whole the positive results are, necessarily, somewhat scanty. There is much discussion of the views of other scholars, his criticism of whom is often just; but at other times his arguments are far from convincing, and there is a tendency now and then to use a conjectural conclusion as an established basis for further conjectures. He prints on p. 57 ff. a complete re-edition of the papyrus mentioned above, into which he introduces a number of new readings. Some are happy, and one of his suggestions has been adopted by Wilcken in the text of the papyrus printed by him in his *Chrestomathie*; but several are too daring to be convincing. In particular his reading of $\tau\rho(\acute{\iota})\tau\eta \mu(\omicron\lambda)\rho\alpha$ and IZ in l. 5, and of Δ in l. 14 does not accord well with the facsimile. There is certainly writing there; but he appears to have overlooked the remark of the original editors that the papyrus contains some notes apparently unconnected with the main document, and the writing in l. 5 is one of these. Mr. Johnson kindly informs me that the papyrus is now packed up, and not easily accessible, but that in the original transcript the writing in question is noted as being in inverse order to the main document, and is read as $\text{Ζηνω} \mid \lambda\iota\beta\alpha\nu$. This appears to be confirmed by the facsimile. The supposed Δ in line 14 is perhaps an α belonging to the abbreviation $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho\alpha(\phi\epsilon\nu)$. It may be added that Dr. Cohen takes the document to be a record of letters received and sent, not, as Wilcken regards it, of letters received only, but his arguments do not carry conviction. $\gamma\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\rho(\alpha\phi\epsilon\nu)$ in l. 19 may well refer to the provincial governor, as he holds; but this does not prove his point.

Dr. Viedebantt's volume is a useful addition to the literature dealing with the difficult and complicated subject of ancient metrology. Its contents are of a somewhat miscellaneous character, but it falls into two main divisions. The first is devoted to the work of Epiphanius known as $\pi\epsilon\rho\acute{\iota} \mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\omega\nu \kappa\alpha\iota$

$\sigma\tau\alpha\theta\mu\acute{\omega}\nu$, which has survived only very imperfectly. The author, it seems with justice, questions the appropriateness of this title, holding that the complete work was rather a biblical encyclopaedia, which dealt, among other subjects, with metrology. He devotes a detailed and enlightening discussion to the mutual relations of the Syriac translations and the various Greek excerpts. In the second part of the volume he publishes from Vatican MS. Gr. 2130 five short Greek metrological tracts, the first of which is a new excerpt from Epiphanius, while of the others two were previously unpublished, and discusses the critical and metrological questions to which they give rise. He uses Wilcken's standard work, *Griechische Ostraka*, but seems not to have followed very closely subsequent papyrological literature. Thus on p. 90f. he rejects Hultsch's view that the new artaba introduced by the Romans was equivalent to $3\frac{1}{2}$ Roman modii, holding that it was, as stated by three texts, really equivalent to 3 modii; but on the other hand he accepts the view of Hultsch, and of Wilcken in the *Ostraka*, that this new artaba was the 'thesauric artaba.' He has overlooked the evidence of P. Lips. I. 97, on the strength of which Wilcken has now (*Grundzüge*, p. lxix.) abandoned his view of the identity of the Roman and the thesauric artaba. In that papyrus occurs a $\mu\acute{\epsilon}\tau\rho\nu \mu\omicron\delta\iota\omega\nu$, which, as Mitteis shows in his introduction, is roughly equivalent to $3\frac{1}{2}$ modii, is clearly distinct from the thesauric measure, and, from its name, may naturally be taken as the official Roman artaba—i.e. the artaba 'in das der römische Modius umgerechnet wird' (Mitteis, p. 251). An element of difficulty is now added to the question by P. Cair. Masp. II. 67138, where corn payments for the *embola* are made in an artaba equivalent to 3 modii. Was an alteration made in the capacity of the official artaba in later times? And does this account for the difference between our authorities¹?

¹ Since the above was written I have found in the British Museum a papyrus (to be published in Vol. V. of the B.M. Catalogue) containing evidence which perhaps clears up the

The volume contains a plate giving a facsimile of two pages of the Vatican MS., tables of the measures in the various texts of Epiphanius, and good indices.

Dr. San Nicolò's book deals with a subject on which papyri afford a fair amount of evidence, the associations and guilds of Graeco-Roman Egypt. The scheme of the work excludes certain classes of corporations. The author points out that Greek and Roman law did not clearly distinguish between public and private associations; but we may say roughly that those embraced by this work belong rather to the latter category, while such more obviously official bodies as the colleges of priests or officials, the ethnic associations, and the like are excluded. Though, as already said, there is a fair amount of evidence, it is not by any means always unambiguous, and it may be doubted whether some of the associations recorded by the author were really associations at all—a doubt which, indeed, he himself admits. The present volume, which is the first of two, is mainly occupied with the collection of evidence for the various kinds of associations, which the author classes as 'Kultvereine,' 'Vereine von Altersgenossen,' 'Agonistische Vereine,' 'Berufsvereine,' and 'Private und sonstige Vereine.' He has read widely, and overlooks little published evidence, and his collection of the material will be very useful for purposes of reference; but it cannot be said that any new conclusions of great importance are established. For such conclusions the second volume will probably afford more scope.

One or two single points may be noted. On p. 29 the author remarks that even after the Roman conquest the 'Verehrung der Ptolemäer . . . bestand . . . als inoffizieller Kult noch in der Kaiserzeit fort.' This is, to say the least, misleading. The cult of Soter at Ptolemais, to which he refers, was not a case in point, but was due to the foundation of the city by Ptolemy Soter; he was worshipped not as a

Ptolemy, but as the god of the city; and the cult of a Cleopatra (see Wilcken, *Chrest.* 115), though puzzling, can certainly not be used to support his contention; it is noteworthy that she is identified with Aphrodite, and this, as Wilcken remarks, may account for the survival of the cult. Nor is it quite accurate to say (*ib.* note 2) that there are no certain traces of a Roman cult in Egypt; for that of Jupiter Capitolinus at Arsinoe was clearly such, though it is likely enough (Wilcken, *Grundzüge*, p. 116) that it stood on a different footing from the other cults of Egypt. On p. 31 the author rightly leaves undecided the question whether the gymnasia were open to non-Greeks. The matter is now settled by a papyrus in the British Museum to which I have called attention in the *Archiv für Papyrusforschung* VI., which shows an Egyptian family described as ἀπὸ γυμνασίου. In regard to the chapter on 'Berufsvereine' it may be noted that P. Hamb. I. 56, published since this volume, affords further valuable evidence on Byzantine guilds. On p. 128 the author's inference of a 'Genossenschaft der geschulten Lohnarbeiter' from P. Lond. IV. 1419, 1215 may be doubted; the entry under ὑπὲρ τῶν συντεχνιτῶν merely gives the total payments by all the guilds; a payment for the bronze-smiths is for some reason deducted from this, and the other guilds are specified below. On p. 194, note 3, the reference to an ἐπόικιον ποιμένων at Aphrodito in P. Heid. III. 1, p. 110 requires correction. This ἐπόικιον is always called Ποιμήν as an indeclinable proper name. The volume contains a good many misprints in the Greek quotations. On p. 109, l. 13 'kaiserlicher' is evidently a slip of the pen for 'königlicher.'

The fourth work on the list, which is the first of a projected series of volumes, deals mainly with the officials of the Ptolemaic fiscus, and for the most part with the οἰκονόμοι of various grades, their functions and place in the official hierarchy. The relationship to one another and to the public of the numerous officials of the financial organization is a complicated and difficult one, and it is a useful task that

matter. It records two modii standing to the artaba in the relation respectively of 3 and $3\frac{1}{2}$: 1.

the author has set himself, though some of his conclusions seem to rest on a rather conjectural basis. He gives at the end classified lists of the *οἰκονόμοι* known to us, which will serve as a conspectus of the available evidence. He makes a curious blunder on p. 36 (see too Table I., pp. 58, 59), where he regards the Ptolemais of P. Petrie II. 25 as the Greek city so called, and naturally finds it noteworthy 'dass der Ökonom des Arsinoitischen Gaues seinen Amtssitz in der freien Griechenstadt Ptolemais hat!' The fact is, of course, that the place in question is *Πτολεμαῖς ἡ ἐπὶ τοῦ ὄρμου*, which was a village in the Arsinoite nome, and the context seems to make it clear that the person who had his 'Amtssitz' there was not the *οἰκονόμος*, but his deputy Charmes. The volume contains a surprisingly large number of misprints.

A good deal of attention has been paid lately to the judicial system of Ptolemaic Egypt; reference need only be made to Zucker's *Beiträge* (*Philologus*, Supplementband XII. Heft 1), to Mitteis's treatment of the subject in his *Grundzüge*, and to Lesquier's introduction to P. Lille II. Semeka's work, of which the volume under review is only the first, is much the most elaborate study which has yet appeared, and, in spite of some deficiencies, it deserves high praise. It is, indeed, unfortunate that it should have appeared too soon for the author to incorporate in it the valuable evidence of the already famous *Dikaionmata*, which, though relating primarily to Alexandrian procedure, adds materially to our knowledge on many points treated in the present work. Thus on p. 139 ff. he commits himself to a view of the *πολιτικοὶ νόμοι*

which is no longer tenable since the appearance of the *Dikaionmata*. Again, his assumption on p. 123 of jurisdiction by the *Chrematistae* in Alexandria and the other Greek cities becomes, in the light of the new evidence, improbable in the extreme. But though the unfortunate synchronism in the appearance of the two volumes renders some of Semeka's conclusions obsolete from the first, he will perhaps be able to utilize the new evidence by way of addenda to his second volume, and in any case his positive contributions to the subject he deals with are considerable. He lays stress on a fact which in dealing with such a subject one is often tempted to forget, that Ptolemaic law, not only in its practice, but in its theory, was less definite in many of its distinctions than modern law; that, for example, the 'Unterschied zwischen privatrechtlichen und strafrechtlichen Eingaben bezw. Klagen' was never systematically marked out; and he is more careful than some of his predecessors not to give to his picture of Ptolemaic procedure a degree of system which it did not attain, though in some cases even he seems to base on isolated pieces of evidence conclusions which they will hardly bear. Of special interest is his insistence on the judicial competence of the strategus. The present volume is devoted mainly to a discussion of the various judicial authorities, but the latter portion deals with actual procedure, a subject which will be continued in the second volume. There are a few, but not many, misprints; by a curious slip the author several times (pp. 266, 270, 274 f.) refers to the class of document called *ἐμφανισμός* as *τὸ ἐμφανισμόν*.

H. I. BELL.

MURRAY'S TRANSLATION OF THE RHESUS.

The Rhesus of Euripides. Translated by GILBERT MURRAY, LL.D., D.Litt. F.B.A. Crown 8vo. Pp. xii + 67. London: George Allen, May 23, 1913. Cloth, 2s. net. Paper, 1s. net.

THE name of Euripides is better known in England to-day than it has been for

very many years, and that fact is mainly due to the translations of Professor Murray and the performances of his versions. This translation follows the lines of his previous renderings of plays; the iambics are translated into rhyming heroics, with great variety of pause; the choruses are translated into

widely different lyrical metres, among which the system of Tennyson's 'Daisy' is happily employed in the chorus that immediately precedes the entrance of Rhesus; one new experiment has been used this time in the Ossianic dirge with which the Muse laments her Thracian son. To review the verse translation of Professor Murray would be a belated task: it is only necessary to say that the same charm of language, the same subtle fancy, and the same power of giving meaning to slight touches in the original, with which his readers are now familiar, will be found here to the full. The translator is not only a professor, but a producer, not only διδάσκαλος, but χοροδιδάσκαλος; and the stage-directions are of special interest as coming from one of his experience; they do not, of course, profess to indicate what was done on the Attic stage, but how Professor Murray would wish to see it done; the part that is played by Dolon's wolfskin is specially suggestive,

In this Review it is the introduction that should perhaps claim chief attention. *Rhesus* as a literary creation has had a much disputed pedigree, with a suggestion of the bar sinister in every generation. Some years ago it would have been generally said that in the *Rhesus* we had a play, certainly not by Euripides, though bearing his name, and derived from a Book of the *Iliad* that could not possibly be by Homer. A few years ago Mr. Andrew Lang undertook to show that in vocabulary the *Doloneia* did not differ more from the other books of the *Iliad* than any other one book could be found to differ. Now Professor Murray defends the Euripidean authorship of the *Rhesus*, and in the course of his defence mentions that against the 177 words peculiar to the play among the dramas of Euripides we may set 220 in the much shorter *Cyclops*. He argues that we cannot set aside the external tradition, that the play suggests early achievement rather than imitative mediocrity, that there are touches like the lament of the Muse-mother at the end that are quite Euripidean. He finds it, therefore,

easiest to believe that it was an early work of Euripides, while he was still under Aeschylean influence, and that it was a pro-Satyrical play, a fact which would account for the somewhat special vocabulary and peculiar features of the play. He shows successfully that the use of the fourth actor is only apparent, and does not involve a late date.

Certainly it is difficult to believe that the play was not written in the fifth century, or that it was a conscious imitation of one of the great Three. The Sophoclean stamp that had been noticed in antiquity is not very apparent, except, perhaps, in the greater relevancy of the choruses and the interposition of the deity not as a *deus ex machina*, but in the action of the play; but the number of verbal parallels in Sophocles is even smaller than in Euripides. And if anybody was deliberately setting himself to imitate Euripides, would his play have had no prologue, no ἐμβόλημα, no *deus ex machina*? The dramatic construction of the play does not absolutely debar it from claiming Euripides as its author; for, although there is a curious oscillation of interest between the Dolon story and the Rhesus story, we have a duality of plots in the *Hecuba*, and the *Troades*, beautiful as it is, has an episodic character, though one which does not prevent it being truly dramatic. We notice that all these plays deal with Troy and have their scene laid in a camp. I have selected these three plays for another test to see if a further similarity could be found in them, and I find a result which at least is curious, even if no very definite conclusions can be drawn from it. A rapid calculation of trisyllabic feet in iambic lines gives me, including proper names, 58 examples in the *Rhesus*, 150 in the *Hecuba*, 195 in the *Troades*; but the strange thing is that of the 58 examples 22 are parts of πολέμιος (one πόλεμος), while in the *Hecuba* πολέμιος only comes seven times, and in the *Troades* only once (πόλεμος once also). The comparative absence of trisyllabic feet suggests early work.

Professor Murray has pointed out elsewhere (*Euripides and His Age*, p. 44), the interest that Athenians would

have been likely to feel in Thrace during Euripides' early days, and that is the period to which all the evidence would lead us to refer the play; but would anything except external tradition have made us assign this play to Euripides, if it had been recently discovered? After all, there must have been work at least as good as this play done by those

dramatists who beat the great tragedians in the Dionysiac contests. Is it not possible that we have in this play the work of one of them which has survived owing to some accident that we know nothing of, and which became confused quite early with Euripides' play of the same name?

A. S. OWEN.

Keble College.

GREEK FINAL CLAUSES.

Commentationes Aenipontanae, quas edit E. KALINKA. VII. De enuntiatis Graecorum finalibus, scr. I. KNUENZ, 44 pp. 9½' × 6½'. Innsbruck.

IN this treatise we have a summary of what is known of Greek final clauses (including 'pure final,' 'object' clauses, clauses dependent on verbs of fearing) from Homer to Lucian. For the most part it is a mere summary, a series of statistics, telling how many times in each author a construction occurs, and not attempting to show, except in a very general way, the difference between similar constructions, or the reason why one was preferred to another. Hence it is not in itself an interesting study. But it is useful as a supplement to other works. It puts together in a short space the results of a large number of separate studies. It helps us to watch the process of development. If we are in doubt as to the reading or the interpretation of a passage it enables us to see what authors make use of the construction in question and to what extent. If the usage is uncommon, the references are generally given, though not quite so often as we could wish.

The account of the final sentence in modern books is based to a great extent on Ph. Weber's *Entwicklungsgeschichte der Absichtssätze* (published in 1884-5 as part of M. Schanz's *Beiträge zur historischen Syntax der griechischen Sprache*). A detailed abstract of this work together with many valuable and interesting comments was given by Prof. Gildersleeve in the *American Journal of Philology*, vols. iv. and vi. Weber went down to Aristotle. Mr. Knuenz

has made Weber's work the basis of his own, but he has revised W.'s figures and has pursued the history of these sentences down to the Atticists. He has also himself made a study of the works which go under the name of Hippocrates, and has stated in detail the results which he has obtained for each of them separately. These writings are important in the history of the language, but the evidence which they provide of syntactical usage has hitherto been to a great extent neglected. There is no reference to Hipp. in the Index to the Examples in Goodwin's *Moods and Tenses*. J. M. Stahl, whose *Syntax des griech. Verbums* often proves useful in supplementing Goodwin, quotes Hipp. at times, but he has not noticed (485) that in some of the Hippocratic writings the future ind. is not uncommon in pure final clauses. K. counts thirty-four examples with ὅπως and five with ὥς. In most of these he regards the reading as certain. Goodwin (§ 324, note) says 'Only four undoubted examples occur in prose.' Stahl accepts a much larger number. It is clear from the frequency of this construction in Aristophanes that in popular speech the 'pure final' was often not distinguished from the 'object clause.' It is a pity that K. did not include Menander and the other comic poets; on this and other points it would be interesting to know how they compare with Aristophanes. I pass to another point on which K. has something new to say. Prof. Gildersleeve wrote (*A. J. P.* iv. 443): 'What Weber says of Hippokrates, does not rest on personal research of his own . . . The most important point is the exclusive use of ὥς in complete final sentences.'

Weber was mistaken. K. shows that (1) in fourteen of the treatises *ὥς*, (2) in twenty-one *ὅκως*, is the prevailing (or the only) particle employed in the pure final clause. If we sum up the occurrences in these two groups separately we get the following numbers:

	<i>ὥς</i>	<i>ὥς ἄν</i>	<i>ὅκως</i>	<i>ὅκως ἄν</i>	<i>ἵνα</i>
Group (1) ...	82	11	18	1	8
Group (2) ...	16	3	85	12	7

If we compare these statistics with Goodwin, p. 398, we see that, as K. says, 'ista scripta Hippocratica in usu particularum finalium omnino singularia sunt,' especially in the comparative rarity of *ἵνα*. In the preference of *ὥς* the first group resembles the tragedians, with all of whom it is the favourite particle; *ὥς* is also used to some extent by Hdt. and to a considerable extent by Xen., who is in this as in so many ways peculiar; but in the orators and Plato together there are not half-a-

dozen examples. The *ὅκως* group may be compared with Thuc. and Xen. who prefer *ὅπως* to other final particles, but also use *ἵνα* freely.

K. has done his work carefully. But there is one figure which needs some explanation. He says on p. 40 (cp. pp. 10 and 15) that there are in the *Iliad* and *Odyssey* 102 examples of *ὥς* (without *κέν* or *ἄν*) in pure final sentences. Ebeling in his *Lexicon Homericum* (1880) gives twenty-four or twenty-five, Goodwin (p. 398) following Weber gives the same number. To the bibliography might be added: J. F. Dobson, '*ὥς ἄν* and *ὅπως ἄν* in the Tragedians,' *Classical Review*, xxiv., (1910), pp. 143-4; W. W. Goodwin, *Syntax of the Moods and Tenses of the Greek Verb*, Rewritten, 1897. K. apparently knows Goodwin only by his Greek Grammar.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

St. Paul's School, West Kensington, W.

THE EMANCIPATION OF ROMAN WOMEN.

Zur Geschichte der Frauenemanzipation im alten Rom. Von JOHANNES TEUFER. Pp. 43. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. M. 1.

THIS is a study of the opening chapters of Livy's thirty-fourth book, where the historian contrasts Cato the upholder of ancient tradition with the women who claimed an increasing freedom. The repeal of the Oppian Law was accompanied with such circumstances as those with which now we are familiar. The women of Rome, who resented the restrictions imposed upon them by the Oppian Law, refused to stay within doors. They occupied the approaches to the forum. 'They even dared,' says Livy, 'to approach and ask the support of the consuls, praetors and other magistrates.' Two of the tribunes had announced their intention of defending the obnoxious law. They were besieged in their houses and yielded. In the end the women gained the day and the hated law was repealed with the consent of all the tribes. Such is the setting of the speeches of Cato and Valerius.

Dr. Teufer has published this pamphlet as a preliminary to a larger work. After a translation of the two speeches, he examines their authenticity, and has little difficulty in showing that they were composed by the historian himself and that they contain little of Cato and less of Valerius. The rest of the pamphlet deals briefly with the legalized assemblages of women, which are traced to a religious origin; the position of women under the civil law; their part in public life. Obviously these large topics can only receive a superficial handling within the few pages which are devoted to them. I venture, however, to think that something should be added to what the author tells us about Livy's own treatment of the subject.

Since the two speeches are composed as a rhetorical exercise in which the arguments of Cato against the repeal of the Oppian Law are balanced by those of Valerius for the repeal of the Oppian Law, we cannot glean from them the opinions of the historian. But the frame in which the speeches are set contains some striking touches

in which we may trace Livy's own attitude to the emancipation of women. He interrupts the history of war to deal with a topic which he almost disdains to mention, *res parva dictu*. The behaviour of the Roman wife towards her husband is, or should be, governed by a natural modesty in presence of his authority and express orders, *auctoritate verecundia imperio*. It was presumption on her part even to approach and make requests to the leading magistrates. Here surely we see the provincial so far overwhelmed by the traditions of the great families of Rome, that he is blind to the facts before his eyes. The increasing influence of women is shown in two directions at least. In the first place it was already a tradition in the Julian house that women should stand by their husband's side in great affairs. The aunt of the dictator accompanied her husband in his campaign against the Teutones. Caesar refused to be separated from Cornelia even in order to secure himself. Livia looked upon the world—and upon Livy—with those calm imperial eyes that blend with the eyes of Venus in the museum at Arles. Not without meaning, therefore, was Venus the especial goddess of the Julii.

Through the patronage of noble Roman ladies foreign religions spread because of the hopes which they held out to women. And among these religions Christianity stood upon the threshold of the future. When therefore Augustus with a magnanimous jest described Livy as a Pompeian, he reached the limits of criticism. Livy drew his picture of an impossible past, of a Rome which never existed. It is also true that the partisans of Caesar failed to comprehend the whole of Rome. But Caesar's own *Commentaries* suggest that the modern student of Roman history has suffered greatly by the sifting out of the sources which the literature of the opposition completed in the interests of the Senate. The emperors of the first century and the ladies of their court are seen only through misrepresentations not less calculated than those of our own partisan press. It is not difficult, therefore, to thank Dr. Teufer for the promise of the work to which he has committed himself, and to express the hope also that he will subject his sources to a more rigorous criticism than in Livy's case.

FRANK GRANGER.

University College, Nottingham.

NEW TEUBNER TEXT OF THE *DE SENECTUTE*.

M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior de Senectute liber. Ed. C. SIMBECK. Pp. 1-58. Leipzig: Teubner. 1912.

DR. SIMBECK has studied carefully the chief MSS. which contain the *Cato Maior*, and provides a fuller apparatus than was previously in existence. The most valuable of the new material which he has collected, is a collation of Brux. 9591 (*b*), cent. ix. This MS. had previously been used by Anz and Kornitzer. Simbeck has used a photographic reproduction made for Vollmer. He says that the character of the hand closely resembles that found in the Paris MS. of the Verrines, 7774 A, and the Holkham MS. 387, collated by Dr. Peterson. Apparently it is a product of the Tours *scriptorium*. He gives a good account of the script in which it

is written and the compendia employed. In view of its antiquity and importance the MS. seems to deserve the honour of a capital letter, rather than a twelfth century MS. *Benedictoburanus*, which he allows to retain the symbol *B*.

Simbeck terms the archetype Ω . His use of this symbol is sometimes confusing. Thus § 73 he says *consequatur* Ω , *om.* V^1 , *add.* V^2 . This seems somewhat roundabout. It would be simpler to say, *consequatur om.* V^1 . On § 2, he says, *sicut* Ω , *sic Charisi codex*. As he prints *sicut*, the point of the note is not clear. In § 10 he prints *oenus*, and says in his note *unus* Ω . It would be well to say who made the change, just as in the next line he ascribes *noenum* to Lachmann. On p. 15, he says *fort. domo mos patrius*, but in his note on § 37 he quotes four MSS. for

the reading. On the same page he says *fortasse*, percontantibus, without mentioning that the conjecture was made previously by Mommsen, as he records in his note on § 20.

Simbeck's text is very conservative on the whole. It may be questioned, if he does not go too far in reading (§ 1) with the MSS.—

teque cognomen non solum Athenis deportasse sed humanitatem et prudentiam intellego.

Here editors generally give *non solum cognomen*, which seems necessary.

The few emendations which he suggests are not convincing—e.g. § 32: *nemo adhuc convenire me voluit cui fuerim occupatus*. The MSS. generally have *qui* (i.e. *quoi*) or *cum*. The dative gives an excellent sense—i.e., 'I never pleaded an engagement when anyone wished to see me.' Simbeck suggests *quin*, which seems contrary to the sense. In § 18 the MSS., except HE, give—

senatui quae sint gerunda praescribo et quo modo Karthagini cui male iam diu cogitanti bellum multo ante denuntio.

Here Müller marks a lacuna after *quo modo*. Simbeck emends *cui* to *cum*. This use of *cum* seems odd and the collocation *Karthagini cum . . . denuntio* is still more odd. I venture to think that *cui* is a corruption of the common dia-critical mark *qu* or *q* (= *quaere*), used to show that there is something wrong,

which has got into the text from the margin. If so, the addition *inferatur* given by HE (without *cui*) may well be right.

Simbeck introduces a number of archaic spellings—e.g. *quor* (§ 13), *quoius* (§ 14). It seems strange to find combined with these the spelling *fili* (§ 12). The only reference which I have observed to a metrical point is on § 4 *quam putavissent*. Here he says 'putavissent sic Ω, nota clausulam.' There is nothing remarkable about the clausula, which is Zielinski's i. β.

The editor refers to an early work of my own thus (p. 9):

'Quod V saepe a P et L discrepat. Clarkius censebat eum neque ex P aut L redire. Quae opinio falsa est.'

I quite agree that it would be. But my words were:

'*LA* represent one family, and *P* the other, both being referred back to the same archetype. *V* resembles *P* rather than *L*.'¹

I say here distinctly, that *V* does go back to the same *fons* as *P* and *L*, and is more closely connected with *P* than with *L*. Our opinions are identical, as will be seen from Simbeck's *Stemma*.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

Queen's College, Oxford.

¹ *Anecdota Oxoniensia*, vii., p. xx (1892).

LEO'S HISTORY OF LATIN LITERATURE.

LEO's *History of Latin Literature*. Vol. I. (*Archaic Literature*). Published by Weidmann, Berlin. 1913. Price 12s.

THIS volume, the first instalment of a complete history of Latin literature, is a beautiful piece of work, representing the mature thought of a great scholar on a subject to which the studies of a lifetime had been directed. It is sad indeed to have to add that the history to which it belongs will never be completed, and that readers who wish to form an idea of the way in which the author would have treated the subsequent periods of Latin literature, must turn to the sketch which he published

in Hinneberg's *Kultur der Gegenwart*.¹ In the present volume the development of Latin verse and prose is traced from Livius Andronicus to Lucilius with a firm hand and with a wealth of illustration which attracts and convinces the reader. Leo has clearly envisaged the whole story, and he speaks with the authority of one who is a master of all the details that go to make up the picture. It is not a mere book of reference, like Teuffel's; it is a book to be read through continuously: for a unity of conception dominates the whole.

¹ An obituary notice of Professor Leo appeared in the *Classical Review* for February, 1914.

The leading idea is the recognition that Latin literature, deeply indebted as it was to Greece, was not a mere reflexion of Greek literature, but rather a continuation of it on lines determined by the genius of the Roman people. The Romans did not, like so many barbarous peoples, merely take on a varnish of Greek culture; they made out of the elements of that culture something of their own, which was superior to the products of contemporary Greek work (pp. 50, 62, etc.). And it was the originality of Latin literature which qualified it to exercise the enormous influence which it actually did exercise on the literatures of other nations.

The difficulties which the creators of Latin literature had to face and overcome are powerfully stated. The language was in a crude condition, and there was practically nothing in the way of popular song or ballad or drama on which the first writers could build. Leo rejects the account of the early development of the drama which is given by Livy (vii. 2), availing himself of the main results arrived at by Hendrickson. The only preparation which had been made for the work of Livius Andronicus and his successors lay in the field of 'Recht und Rede,' which is lucidly treated in Chapter II. Rhetoric, developed for practical purposes in the Senate, the popular assemblies, and the law courts, was in fact the principal means by which the Latin language was turned into material which the early poets could use for their own purposes (p. 33).

Chapter III gives an admirable account of the work of Livius Andronicus, setting forth the reasons why he turned to Athens, not to Alexandria, for his models. Andronicus knew nothing of Callimachus; the whole culture of Alexandria was incongruous with the needs of Rome at this time, though, later on, when Rome had herself become metropolitan, the products of Alexandria were welcomed. What Andronicus and other Greek *libertini* brought to Rome was the literature with which they had become familiar in their own homes; and this was not Hellenistic literature. The merit of seeing that Rome offered a field for a

'reincarnation of the spirit of Greek literature'¹ belongs to Andronicus. He was also the creator of Roman metrical art and science: for he not only introduced Greek metres in his dramas, but also latinized them, and thus rendered them capable of living on Roman soil. And to the Saturnian he gave a literary existence in his translation of the *Odyssey* (p. 69). It was reserved for Ennius to see the superiority of the hexameter as the metre for epic poetry. In Leo's account of the iambic and trochiac metres (pp. 64-69) I am glad to see that he fully recognizes the principle to which I have called attention on several occasions, *viz.*, that accent is a structural element in all Latin verse.² I know of no other writer on verse by whom this principle has been stated so clearly. Leo also accepts my doctrine of a 'compensatory accent,' *i.e.*, an accent at one point of the verse compensating for the failure of accent at another point (the fourth rise of iambics, according to Leo, p. 68)—a doctrine since endorsed by Wallstedt.³ As to the so-called 'iamb shortening,' Leo does not go beyond the doctrine expressed in his *Plautinische Forschungen*, 2nd ed., 1912.⁴ Incidentally he dissents from Skutsch's article in *Glotta*, as to the initial accent of Latin having been due to Etruscan influence (p. 10, note).

Justice is done in Chapter IV to the originality and the nationalism of Naevius. He probably prepared the way for the development of metre which we find in Plautus; he was the first to employ 'contaminatio'; and he was the first to write not only 'praetextatae' but also 'togatae' (p. 91 *f.*, *cf.* p. 370).

Chapter V deals with Plautus—his life, his relation to his Greek originals (different in different plays), his great innovation in the metrical field (the lyrical passages, based on contemporary Hellenistic work), his employment of 'contaminatio' and finally his style and language, which is far from being

¹ This is Professor Postgate's phrase.

² *Classical Review*, 1905, p. 252 *ff.* (on the Latin Sapphic): 1906, p. 156 *ff.* (Accent and Quantity in Plautine Verse).

³ *Studia Plautina*, 1909.

⁴ See my article in *Classical Review*, 1913, pp. 237-239.

'vulgar Latin' (p. 148). On the whole I find this chapter, good as it is, less original and interesting than some of the others. Most of the new things that Leo had to say on Plautus had already been written in his *Forschungen*. His discussion of the date of the post-Plautine part of the prologue to the *Casina* (pp. 212-217, ch. vii.) does not seem to me conclusive.

The account of Ennius in Chapter VI reinforces Leo's view as to the originality of Latin literature. When Ennius declared that the soul of Homer dwelled in him, he proclaimed that he was no mere imitator of Homer, but his compeer and rival. And a similar ambition inspired all the early Latin writers. The metrical innovations of Ennius, which mark the third stage in the development of Roman metric (p. 186), are treated in detail. But I am surprised to find in this passage no reference to the rôle of accent in the Ennian hexameter. As to 'iamb-shortening' Ennius no doubt made little use of it in his *Annals*; but Leo seems to force the evidence when he doubts whether Ennius used it at all (p. 185 n.). The instance *Virgines nam sibi quisque domi Romanus habet sas* (*Ann.* 110) is not really disposed of by reading *Virginis* and connecting this word with the preceding sentence; nor is it true that *nam* must always begin a sentence in verse (cf. *Hor. Epist.* II., 1., 186). I must add that I use the term 'iamb-shortening' merely as a *façon de parler*, here as elsewhere.

Caecilius, Pacuvius, and Terence are the subject of Chapter VII ('The successors of Plautus and Ennius'), to which is prefixed a discussion of what Leo calls an important document in the history of Literature—the prologue to the *Casina* of Plautus, ll. 5-20. In the account of Terence, more might have been made of the influence which was exerted on him by his association with the Scipionic circle. Its humanism (described in the next chapter) must have been one of the factors that produced the refinement and the interest in character drawing which are so prominent in Terence. This is not denied by Leo, but it is implied rather than expressed. It is to Terence (or

Menander) that we owe that watchword of Stoicism (*Heaut.* 77):

Homo sum : humani nihil a me alienum puto.

The gem of Chapter VIII ('Literature and Roman Culture') is the account given of the influence of Stoicism on the literature and the life of the second century, B.C. (pp. 315-325). The relation of Polybius to the younger Scipio is beautifully depicted (pp. 316-321 and p. 480, where Polyb. xxxii. 9 is translated). The world-wide significance of Stoicism is due to its connexion with Rome; and the secret of its success in Rome is finely expressed in the following sentence: 'In the Stoic ethics the aspiring Roman found the scientific foundation of the old Roman ideal, as it lived in the tradition of his home.' Full justice is done to 'Romano-stoic humanism' in these pages, and to the fact that it dominated Latin literature from the days of the Scipionic circle to those of Marcus Aurelius, and thus became a potent factor in the romanizing of Western Europe. Its influence on jurisprudence and on philology is also treated in an illuminating way (pp. 348f., p. 361 f.).

The 'togata', Accius, and Lucilius form the subject of Chapter IX. I find myself in complete sympathy with what is here said about Roman satire, and its creator Lucilius. The name, it is true, was used earlier, by Ennius; but his *saturae* had nothing satirical about them. *Satura* proper denotes the type of didactic verse which took its start in the school founded by Lucilius and subsequently represented by Horace, Persius, and Juvenal (p. 206). It is this kind of satire of which Quintilian said '*tota nostra est*' (p. 423).

The book concludes with a 'Rückblick' (pp. 439-443). 'This warlike people was ready to yield to foreign influences, but incapable of giving up its own nature' (p. 439). 'Roman culture is, as a whole, a new culture, which is neither Roman nor Greek, but Romano-Greek' (p. 443).

E. A. SONNENSCHN. E.

30, Calthorpe Road, Edgbaston,
Birmingham,
April 24, 1914.

THE NEW PALAEOGRAPHY.

The Beneventan Script: a History of the South Italian Minuscule. By E. A. LOEW. Pp. xx+384. With many illustrations. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 21s.

LUDWIG TRAUBE, the Munich professor, made a new epoch in Latin Palaeography. He showed us a new world to conquer and how to conquer it. This book, by a pupil of his, following his methods, brings us the spoils from one wide province annexed by this peaceful warfare: we have here the firstfruits of the New Palaeography.

The difference between this account of Beneventan script and previous treatises is the difference between mid-day and twilight, or rather gloom. All was vague before. A palaeographer of the old style, if asked for a verdict on a MS. of this class, say that eleventh to twelfth-century MS. of Juvenal in which Mr. Winstedt found the famous passage, would (in Sterne's phrase) assume a mysterious carriage of the body to cover the defects of the mind, and reply: 'Hum! ha! Lombardic.' He would make the same reply if one showed him (1) any minuscule MS. of France or Italy written before the introduction of Caroline minuscule, (2) most ninth-century MSS. of Germany, or of Switzerland, or of Burgundy, (3) any MS. in Visigothic script, (4) any in the Corbie ab-type, and so on. He might venture to pronounce that Mr. Winstedt's MS. was written in Southern Italy, but he would not be able to stand much cross-examination on his verdict. It is many years since Traube exposed the errors and the dangers of this vague use of the term 'Lombardic'; but old usage dies hard. This book will, we hope, kill and bury it once for all.

Dr. Loew tells us that the designation 'littera Beneventana' for the writing practised in the old Duchy of Benevento, *i.e.* the southern half of Italy, is as early as the eleventh century and probably earlier; that the script itself was developed gradually from the old Italian minuscule (in the eighth century it is still indistinguishable from North Italian

script) until it received its distinctive form in the ninth and tenth centuries; that it reached its highest artistic level in the eleventh, and persisted to the end of the thirteenth. He shows us in detail each criterion for dating and localising, all the minutiae of ligatured letters, of punctuation, of abbreviation. The 'eius' abbreviation is the shibboleth of Beneventan scribes, and is mistaken for 'qui' by other transcribers. He takes us into the scriptorium of Monte Cassino and lets us hear the first instruction of Desiderius' monks in penmanship: how the syllable *ti*, when pronounced like *z*, must be written in a peculiar fashion; how the letter *i*, when pronounced like *y* (or *j*), demanded the long form (making it impossible to mistake, *e.g.*, *ius* for *uis*); how interrogative sentences had to be punctuated in one way if the answer was merely 'Yes' or 'No,' but in another if the answer became a statement of fact. Most of this we learn for the first time from Dr. Loew, and we learn it with such a wealth of illustration and explanation and such a mass of evidence that we can neither doubt it nor forget it.

The greater part of the book is of interest to historians rather than to readers of this journal. Dr. Loew provides, in fact, a history of the spread of culture in Southern Italy from the end of the eighth to the end of the thirteenth century, and shows how historical changes are reflected in the vicissitudes of the script. He gives lists too of the extant MSS., of the scriptoria and of the scribes of Southern Italy, which will be useful to librarians and palaeographers. But classical scholars will find most to interest them within the chapters dealing with the script itself. Beneventan minuscule has played so important a part in the transmission of the Latin Classics¹ that no scholar can afford to be ignorant of at least this branch of Latin Palaeography. Indeed, when we reflect that the Latin texts

¹ Not Varro's *De Lingua Latina* (as stated on p. 18), but merely Priscian's *De Figuris Numerorum*, with a quotation from Varro L. L. V., is contained in Paris 7530.

took most of their injuries from the hands of medieval scribes, it seems little short of amazing that even in our eminently practical nation there should still be Latin scholars who dispense lightly with all study of medieval palaeography. The pages of our learned journals are still filled with long lists of haphazard emendations, which take no account of the conditions under which an author's text was transmitted in writing, and indeed often do not reveal any thorough study of an author's language and style. No self-respecting editor admits one out of a hundred of these emendations into an edition. Yet the flow never ceases. What a waste of time it seems to write them! And how unsatisfying to read them! Sauce, much sauce, is needed for the meagre fare.

This book must be the model for future books on Latin Palaeography. When shall we have a similar account of Irish minuscule, a script equally important for Latin scholars? What is so often said of it, that its conservatism makes it difficult to date, has hitherto been said of Beneventan too. But, as Dr. Loew here shows us, all that was needed was a thorough investigation which left no single specimen of the script unexamined. Beneventan minuscule can now be dated as easily as Caroline. Not the least merit of Sir E. M. Thompson's *Introduction to Palaeography* is that he has made it impossible for teachers of this subject to spend their energies in writing another manual. If they are not to be drones in the hive, they must do some work on Dr. Loew's lines. Even persons who are merely interested in the science and wish to do

what they can to help its progress, will learn from Dr. Loew's book what kind of statistics are worth gathering. Such material, if published in a magazine or handed over to a palaeographer (not a drone), will be of use sooner or later. With our noble collections of MSS., our Palaeographical Society's Publications, our opportunities and love of travel, Englishmen ought surely to take the lead in this new advance.

By the way, we would advise the reader not to begin with Dr. Loew's Preface, which somehow or other suggests that an amateur performance is going to follow, and recalls Professor Zimmer's criticism of a somewhat effusive 'commemoratio beneficentium' by a young author. 'How many cooks!' said the German critic. But Dr. Loew's broth has certainly not been spoiled.

One could wish that the binding, printing and paper were less worthy of the Clarendon Press. For, after all, this is a book rather for the study than the drawing-room, and not every student can afford a guinea for it. There has been too much (in our opinion) needless cutting of new types. For example, why was Dr. Loew not content with the phrase: 'the Corbie ab-script' (with the 'ab' printed in ordinary form)? It should be a matter of conscience with palaeographers to make their publications as inexpensive as possible. A companion-volume by Dr. Loew is announced by the Clarendon Press, *Scriptura Beneventana*, with a large number of plates, to cost £10. Palaeography will be refused admission to University Libraries if this sort of thing goes on.

W. M. LINDSAY.

SOME SCHOOL BOOKS.

THERE is much good work in J. Thompson's *First Year Latin Book* (Cambridge University Press, 2s.); it is well planned, the explanations are clearly put, the print is excellent. But the sentences often seem unsatisfactory in one way or another—e.g. p. 130, *exercitus est tam parvus ut non cum timeamus*, the position of *non* is unnatural,

for *cum* is not intended to be emphatic; or again, p. 53, 'the many gifts and kindnesses of the fort do not open the minds of the savage allies.' The author rightly insists that the words should be common. It is equally important that the whole sentence should be obviously good Latin of an ordinary type. It is not very difficult to make

better sentences with a small vocabulary, but it is necessary constantly to test them by comparison with Latin models.

We have received new editions of *Macmillan's Latin Course*, Part II. (minor changes suggested by recent experience). and of *Limen* (general revision and a few changes in terminology). E. H. Scott and Frank Jones have written *A Shorter Second Latin Course* (Blackie, 2s.) as an alternative to their larger work; the book is based on Caes. B. G. I. 1-29, and is very well done.

In *The Shorter Aeneid* (Bell, 2s. 6d.) Mr. H. H. Hardy, of Rugby aims at giving an idea of the poem as a whole to those who have not time to read more than half of the original; 'many difficult passages and lines do not appear, in particular those in which the mythology or textual uncertainty would require lengthy notes.' A well written summary in English takes the place of the omitted passages. The print is good; there are a few notes at the end. The editor has done his work well, though no doubt everyone will feel, as we do, that some of the omitted passages ought to be there. Professor H. E. Butler, who contributes a Preface and Introduction (both of which are well worth reading), defends the omission of VI. 752-846, in which 'the heroes of the Rome that is to be pass before the eyes of Aeneas,' on the ground that it involves a wide knowledge of Roman history. Yet, surely, from Virgil's day onward this passage has been enjoyed as few other passages have been, and that by many whose notions of the history were very vague. For pupils who know enough Latin to read at some pace this book is well worth considering. But there is an earlier stage for which it does not provide, that in which the pupil is getting used to the language of Virgil. At this stage he must necessarily read slowly. For this preparatory stage we should choose either Book II. or Professor E. V. Arnold's '*Aeneae Facta et Fata*, a stepping-stone to Virgil, with notes and exercises on the text for the use of beginners,' which contains the substance of I., II., and IV. Mr. Hardy has

removed some difficult passages, but we should make a point of attaining a certain facility before beginning his book, so that it might be read rapidly, and some 'idea of the beauty and significance of the poem as a whole' might be gained.

We recommend Professor Granger's *Roma Aeterna* (Dent, 130 pp., 1s. 4d.), especially to those who are familiar with the remains of Ancient and Early Christian Rome. It consists of thirty-one 'Latin readings in the history of the city,' partly drawn from ancient writings, including the Vulgate, partly written by the Editor. A few lines from his Prooemium will explain his purpose: 'Tempus est, mi puer, qui tamdiu linguae Latinae studes, ut intellegere conere, quid litteris Graeci, legibus Romani, praedicatione Christiani effecerint, haec enim ex libris solum non potes discere: sed aedificia ipsa, oppidorum moenia, strata viarum . . . testantur, quales ii fuerint qui fecerunt.' The illustrations and notes are good. We wish the Editor had given us another thirty or forty pages of text instead of the Vocabulary; anyone who is competent to read this book should be able to deal with a Latin dictionary.

J. Marouzeau—*Conseils pratiques pour la traduction du Latin* (59 pp., 1 fr.) —is the author of several excellent grammatical studies, two of which have been noticed in our columns (xxv. 60; xxvi. 129). In this little book he has not a great deal that is new to say, but he writes from such an intimate knowledge of Latin, and puts his advice so well that it is a pleasure to read him. He warns the student against the inappropriate use of 'cette langue traditionnelle de la version latine qui appelle "airain" le "bronze" et "char" la "voiture" . . . En général on s'inspirera de la langue vivante et courante, on repensera les idées de l'auteur latin en français d'aujourd'hui.' He notes some important things, e.g.—a point often ignored in elementary teaching—the emphasis given to the possessive by placing it before the noun: 'meus amicus venit, c'est mon ami à moi qui est venu.' S.

NEW TEUBNER TEXT OF THE *ANNALS*.

P. Cornelii Taciti libros qui supersunt recognovit CAROLUS HALM. Editionem quintam curavit GEORGIUS ANDRESEN. Tomus Prior. Qui libros ab excessu Divi Augusti continet. Lipsiae in aedibus B. G. Teubner. MCMXIII.

THE fifth edition of Halm's *Annals* acquires great authority from the words 'curavit Georgius Andresen' on the frontispiece. Hitherto Dr. Andresen's important contributions to Tacitean textual criticism, which were but sparingly revealed in his revision of Nipperdey, have lain scattered in the 'studia critica et palaeographica,' and in the pages of German periodicals. Now after thirty years, as far at least as the *Annals* are concerned, everything is concentrated in a single volume of this Teubner series. Dr. Andresen has chiefly set his mark on the text of Tacitus by the skill with which he has detected first-hand corrections in Medicean II. These corrections, with certain exceptions—*e.g.* 'augusta' xii. 26, 'duri locis in margine' xii. 55, 'contemnere' xiii. 3, 'ut' for 'utque' xiii. 24, 'cura' xiv. 6, and probably 'humo' xiv. 9, either point to the truer reading or are themselves true. Their value, it may be added, is indirectly attested by Dr. Loew, who believes that they are of such a kind as to make it improbable that the MS. itself is later than 1050 ('Beneventan Script,' p. 137 note).

Through the help of these corrections—first revealed by Dr. Andresen and estimated at their true importance—many difficult passages have been healed. In xii. 64 'sus fetum edidit' is certain, in xiii. 32 the bold emendation of Acidalius 'quem ovasse de Britannis rettuli,' is confirmed by the discovery that M¹ has corrected 'qui' to 'qem.' There are many other places: xi. 8 'properaverat,' xi. 33 'Caesari,' xiii. 14 'inde debilis Burrus,' xv. 28 'laetioris ibi rei,' where M¹ is obviously right. Of xvi. 22 'si imperium everterint,' which is based on a marginal correction, and xi. 28 'cubiculum

per principis exultaverit,' it is not so easy to be positive. But clearly M¹ has suggested the best solutions hitherto available.

Of independent conjectures Dr. Andresen is sparing. In i. 49 he reads 'cuncta' for 'cetera' rather unnecessarily, and the same may be said of 'jungerentur' for 'vincerentur,' ii. 52. In xiv. 39 'post paucas,' xiv. 61 'streptitu venerantium,' xv. 54 'parari jubet idque,' xiii. 31 'et edixit,' are much more certain. Valuable notes in the apparatus appear at i. 34, where the peculiar virgula in the text is explained from other passages, and there are good suggestions, many of which, though not adopted in the text, are probably right, for example: 'ausurum' ii. 8, 'pluribus' iv. 24, 'sane' vi. 14, 'Tettium' xi. 35, ['quin'] xii. 20, 'multa' xiii. 6, 'nocturnosque' xiv. 32, 'Celere' xv. 34. In xiii. 56, the suggestion of a 'lacuna' is certainly preferable to the emendation 'deserentibus,' and in xv. 61 there is much to be said for 'adversus praesentem (*sc.* uxorem) formidine.' Less probable are the conjectures: 'oculis' for 'odiis' in xii. 2, 'oraculum' in xii. 22, 'timore' xv. 63, while the bracketing of 'aut flammandi atque' xv. 44, is extremely doubtful.

Dr. Andresen has done very good service in the matter of proper names—*e.g.* 'Faianio' i. 73, 'Agerinum,' xiv. 7, but very often the authority of an inconsistent scribe is exalted above the requirements of common-sense. Thus in the same chapter (ii. 86) Polionis and Polioni jostle one another, although in iii. 71 where the Medicean gave 'Malluginensem' and 'Maluginensi,' the latter spelling is adopted in both places. In ii. 86 it just happens that Polio is an authentic spelling, and so the common error of which we have an example in iii. 71, is treated as holy and not to be touched. There are other examples—sometimes names and sometimes ordinary words: 'Messalla' iv. 34, but elsewhere 'Messala,' 'Treviros' iii. 40, 'Treviri' i. 41, 'ballistis' xii. 36 'balistis' xv. 9, 'Pharasmanem' xii. 45, 'Pharasmanen' xii.

46. There is nothing to be gained by this kind of thing.

In vi. 29 an inaccuracy of Halm's is repeated. Walther never read 'Sex-tilia,' he only preferred it, and the same is true of Halm's 'poscebantque' in xiii. 52. But Walther, in xiii. 20, did suggest 'si qui,' and should be credited with it, and in the same chapter Puteolanus should be credited with 'et ex.' Lipsius put the beginning of Book VI.

at chapter xi., not at chapter vii. This is another error inherited from the fourth edition.

However, these are small matters. The truth remains that not since Rhe-nanus, Froben's reader at Basle, has any single scholar done more for the text of Tacitus, than the reviser of this fifth edition of the *Annals*.

C. D. FISHER.

Christ Church, Oxford.

SHORT NOTICES

English Literature and the Classics. Collected by G. S. GORDON. 8vo., pp. 252. Oxford: Clarendon Press. 6s. net.

THIS is a collection of nine lectures by Oxford scholars on the influence of classics in the history of literature. The titles are *Tragedy*, by Gilbert Murray, *Platonism* by J. A. Stewart, *Theophrastus* by G. S. Gordon, *Greek Romances* by J. S. Phillimore, *Ciceronianism* by A. C. Clark, *Vergil* by H. W. Garrod, *Ovid* by S. G. Owen, *Satura* by R. J. E. Tiddy and *Senecan Tragedy* by A. D. Godley. The essays vary much in merit from that of a mere uninspired catalogue of parallels between Ovid and English writers from Chaucer downwards, to that of a real appreciation of the subject in question. Mr. Garrod on Virgil as 'half a Celt' is excellent; we have rarely read anything so good within so short a space. Prof. Stewart makes a good distinction between what he calls *personal* and *traditional* Platonism and compares the *Platonic mood* with Wordsworth's 'amplitude of mind' which pictures in tranquillity 'nature's living images.' His essay embodies much of that very spirit of Plato which made *The Myths of Plato* so remarkable a work. The essay on Theophrastus contains very interesting remarks on the connection between character-writing and comedy, 'to every Theophrastus his Menander,' and the whole collection should be very valuable to students of English literature. It should also help to jog the classical

scholar out of any rut into which he may have sunk by presenting to him a wider outlook upon his subject.

R. B. APPLETON.

Quantity and Accent in the Pronunciation of Latin. By F. W. WESTAWAY. Cambridge: University Press. 1913.

MR. WESTAWAY'S heart is in the right place; that is, in what the present reviewer regards as the right place. He is a thoroughgoing adherent of the reformed pronunciation of Latin, and, as that reform still needs advocates in some quarters, his little book will do good service. He has clearly given a considerable amount of attention to the subject, and he writes with conviction. Some points I find very happily put, e.g. his statements about doubled consonants (p. 30), his rules of syllable division (pp. 32, 33), his protest against reading Latin verse with an 'ictus' after the school-boy fashion (p. 88). But some matters of detail call for reconsideration, e.g., the comparison of the Latin diphthong æ with the German ā, which is not a diphthong (p. 11), and the accentuation of words like *cunctāne*, *respicēdum* (p. 69); here the writer puts the accent on the syllable preceding the enclitic, as in *virūmq̄ue*. This point has been set at rest by Wagener. And why should the accentuation *intēr nos* be ruled out (p. 71)? Cf. *apūd me*. The writer seems never to have heard of the accentuation on the first syllable of words of the

shape օօօօ (cf. § 93).¹ And what evidence is there that when an elided vowel is the same as the vowel that follows, it is suppressed *entirely*, e.g., *ergo omnis* = *ergomnis* (p. 41)? Again, synizesis is not due to dislike of hiatus, as is said on p. 43; nor is there reason to suppose that words like *aurca*, *omnia* (three syllables) were offensive to the Roman ear. Why is the form *heri* ('yesterday') ignored on p. 45? That *es* from *edo* has a naturally long vowel is a moot question (p. 47). The whole treatment of English verse in chapter xii. raises questions too thorny to be discussed here. It is intended to point a contrast between English verse and Latin verse. But I am sorry to see that Mr. Westaway does not recognise that accent is a structural element in Latin verse, not only as varying the rhythm, but also as reinforcing it.

The main doctrine of the book is, however, sound. Indeed, the writer is so severely scientific that he is led sometimes to advocate an almost impossibly high ideal of perfection in practice. What are called 'very bad faults' are in some cases surely venial, e.g. the pronunciation of *nisi* as 'nissy' (p. 7). This, however, is a matter of opinion.

E. A. SONNENSCHNEIN.

30, Calthorpe Road, Edgbaston.

TWO DISSERTATIONS ON PROSE METRE.

BLUM. *De compositione numerosa dialogi Ciceronis de Amicitia*. Pp. 1-78. Innsbruck, 1913.

THIS work is modelled upon a previous treatise of A. Ausserer on the clausulae of Minucius Felix and Cicero *de Senectute* (Innsbruck, 1906). Blum adopts Zielinski's method of marking caesura by the symbols α , β , γ , etc., and his three chief forms are in the main identical with those of Zielinski. The other forms are given different names. Thus the S clausulae are termed iv, and Zie-

linski's form iv becomes v. Most of the examples which Blum gives for his other forms (vi, vii, viii) are varieties of Zielinski's form ii. It cannot be said that his terminology makes for lucidity.

The Innsbruck metrists have a way of dealing with iambic words which calls for comment. The rule as given by Quintilian is *est autem in omni voce utique acuta sed nunquam plus una nec unquam ultima ideoque in dissyllabis prior* (1. 5. 31). This being so, it follows that where an iambus comes before the final trochee, e.g. *stabilis potest esse*, there is a conflict between word-accent and ictus. Zielinski's tables show that all combinations in which there is any such conflict were seldom used and in course of time disappeared. Wolf sought to remove the conflict in this particular case by supposing that the personal pronouns (e.g. *meus*), adverbs (e.g. *modo*) and such verbs as *sumus*, *velit* were enclitics. Cauer boldly extends this theory to *iambische Wörter oder iambische Silbenfolge überhaupt* (Pacianus, pp. 14, sqq.). He is followed by Ausserer and Blum, who mark, e.g. *virī boni fuerint, ita dicam gregē*. I can only remark (1) that analogies from comedy prove nothing for the *sermo urbanus*, (2) that the phenomena noticed by Zielinski seem to show that the conflict was felt and avoided, (3) that Cauer's theory is in flat contradiction to the main rule of Latin accentuation as laid down by Quintilian.

It is difficult to see why Blum should find it necessary to discuss such an elementary fact as the lengthening of a short vowel by position. Thus (p. 4.) he writes *erit laetabitur, faciemus rogati*, etc.; and proceeds to argue that the vowel must be lengthened, in order to produce a good rhythm.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

Queen's College, Oxford.

Tacitus, Dialogus. By W. PETERSON.
Agricola, Germania. By M. HUTTON.
(Loeb Series.) Heinemann.

THIS is a useful volume of rather unequal merit. Professor Peterson has done much work on the dialogue, and

¹ This alternative accentuation (e.g. *facilius*, side by side with *facilius*) is supported by the evidence of Old Latin dramatic verse and also of Ciceronian clausulae.

though one regrets that he clings to an early date for its composition in spite of the Maternus passage in Dio. lxvii. 12, all that he says is worth saying and complete. It is not quite the same with Professor Hutton's portion of the work. A reader need only consult the bibliographies prefixed to the two translations to form a comparative judgment. The bibliography given by Professor Peterson is really of some value, but to give Boissier, as Professor Hutton does, for the sole book of general reference on Tacitus, is rather inadequate. Again, in the matter of MSS., while Professor Peterson calls attention to the Iesi MS. and Annibaldi's work upon it, no mention is made of this MS. by Professor Hutton. Probably collaboration in a single introduction at the beginning of the book instead of the three introductions in three different places, the first independent of the other two, would have been the wiser plan. The translation, however, is the main object of this series. Professor Peterson is accurate, if rather unadorned; but Professor Hutton, though sometimes felicitous, is often undignified and transatlantic in his idiom. 'Sometimes it even chooses

the winner' for 'aliquando et elegit' rather suggests a bookmaker, and the translation 'he decided to put his hatred in cold storage' for 'statuit reponere odium,' sounds like a phrase from the 'Letters of a self-made merchant to his son.' The word 'trek' is undesirable, and 'tattle and tragedy' is insignificant for 'famam fatumque' in c. 42 of the *Agricola*. As an instance of over-translation, one might quote 'they flaunted like a meteor past the fleet' for 'ut miraculum praevehebantur,' 'vigilant courtesy' is hardly right for 'comitate curandi,' and the phrase 'Germanorum libertas' means more in fewer words than 'the Germans fighting for liberty.'

One may wonder at the use in such a series of some of the appendices. In Professor Peterson these appendices take the form of critical notes of a rather advanced kind, while Professor Hutton gives a long dissertation on Roman names, and follows it up with some cheerful observations on 'terminological exactitudes' in connection with 'barditus.'

C. D. FISHER.

Christ Church, Oxford.

NOTES AND NEWS

WE have received a copy of *Iris*, the news-sheet of the Classical Association of Victoria. It is to be published monthly, showing the events to come. This number announces two series of lectures, one in the morning, one in the afternoon, about once a fortnight; the subjects are either a classical author (such as Virgil, Catullus, Horace), or a classical topic (Classics at the Cross-roads, Aeschylus and Shakespeare, Our Debt to Greece). Personal notes follow. Our readers will welcome this evidence of life in distant places, and wish all success to the Victorian branch.

A specimen has been sent to us of a new Latin periodical, *Alma Roma: singulis mensibus editum Romae, Via del*

Governo Vecchio 96 (9 lire per annum in Italy; 12 lire, or 10s., abroad), edited by Dr. Joseph Fornari. It is not illustrated, like *Vox Urbis*. It contains political notes, a paper on 'Martialis Rusticanus,' one on the source of Dante's *Divina Comedia*, verses, some general articles on art or morals, a dialogue, reviews, and 'Roma Sacra.' Its tone is indicated by the motto: 'Quidquid non possidet armis, religione tenet.'

A correspondent has kindly sent us a prospectus from Carolus Beyaert, a publisher in Bruges, setting forth a collection of *Bullaria Ordinum Religiosorum vel Pontificum*, which he proposes to publish. It is written in

clear and good Latin, which amongst other things promises good print and paper: istud porro chartae genus numquam ex vetustate lurida fiet sed album suum nitorem semper servabit. Belgium, as our readers know, has pro-

duced two excellent books of Latin lessons in Latin: may this be a sign that there is felt to be a better way than Esperanto! Anyhow, civilisation owes much to Belgium. Vivat in aeternum Belgarum gloria!

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

** * * Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

- Bezard* (J.) *Comment apprendre le Latin à nos fils.* 7½" × 4½". Pp. 424. Paris: Vuibert, 1914.
- Boll* (F.) *Aus der Offenbarung Johannis. Hellenistische Studien zum Weltbild der Apokalypse.* 9" × 6". Pp. viii + 151. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 5.
- Byrde* (O. R. A.) *Euripides, Heracles.* 7½" × 5". Pp. xviii + 62. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Cloth, 2s. 6d.
- Edmonds* (C. D.) *Greek History for Schools.* 8¼" × 5½". Pp. xviii + 330, with 37 illustrations, 5 text figures, and 14 maps. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net.
- Herculanensium Voluminum quae supersunt* (Collectio Tertia). 15" × 10½". Pp. 72. Milan: A. Hoepli, 1914. Paper board portfolio, L. 30.
- Kochalsky* (A.) *Das Leben und die Lehre Epikurs.* 7½" × 5¼". Pp. viii + 78. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 1.80.
- Kohler* (J.) und *Wenger* (L.) *Allgemeine Rechtsgeschichte. I. Orientalisches Recht und Recht der Griechen und Römer. Teil II., Abteilung VII.* 10" × 6¾". Pp. vi + 302. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 9.
- Livy* (Books I.-V.). Vol. I. R. S. Conway and C. F. Walters. Oxford Text. 7½" × 5". Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Cloth, 4s.
- Mattingly* (H.) *Outlines of Ancient History.* 8" × 5¼". Pp. xii + 482. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- Novem Carmina*, in certamine poetico Hoeufftiano magna laude ornata. 10" × 6½". Amsterdam: Muller, 1914.
- Reese* (W.) *Die Griechischen Nachrichten über Indien.* 9" × 6". Pp. 106. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 3.
- Schmekel* (A.) *Die Positive Philosophie in ihrer Geschichtlichen Entwicklung.* 2ter Band. 9¼" × 6". Pp. x + 290. Berlin: Weidmann, 1914. M. 10.
- Schonack* (W.) *Ein Jahrhundert Berliner Philologischer Dissertationen (1810-1910).* 8½" × 5". Pp. x + 232. Wolfenbüttel: J. Zwissler, 1914. M. 7.50.
- Tacitus* (Dialogus de Oratoribus). Von A. Gudeman. 2te Auflage. 9½" × 6½". Pp. viii + 528. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 14.
- Wendland* (P.) *Rede auf Friedrich Leo.* 9½" × 6½". Pp. 24. Berlin: Weidmann, 1914. M. 0.80.

The Classical Review

NOVEMBER, 1914

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

AD PLUTARCHI DE PYTHIAE ORACULIS.

C. 2, pag. 395B. DIOGENIANUS peculiarem aeris colorem magnopere admirans, causam eius rei quaerit: τὸν μὲν γὰρ Κορίνθιον οὐ τέχνη <φασιν> ἀλλὰ συντυχία τῆς χροᾶς λαβεῖν τὸ κάλλος ἐπινειμαμένου πυρὸς οἰκίαν ἔχουσάν τι χρυσοῦ καὶ ἀργύρου, πλείστον δὲ χαλκὸν ἀποκείμενον· ὧν συγχυθέντων καὶ συντακέντων ὄνομα τὸν χαλκὸν (Paton; codd. τοῦ χαλκοῦ) τῷ μείζονι τὸ πλήθος παρασχεῖν (Paton; codd. παρέσχεν).

φασίν Bernadacis et Paton suppleverunt. Collatis tamen quae sequuntur: ἄλλον λόγον ἡμεῖς ἀκηκόαμεν πανουργέστερον et paulo infra: ἀλλὰ ταῦτα κακεῖνα μῦθός ἐστιν potius exspectes μυθολογοῦσιν vel simile quid.

In posteriore sententiae parte pro τῷ μείζονι τὸ πλήθος Stegmann proposuit τὸ μείζον· πλήθος, Hartman, *Mnem.* 1913, p. 355: τοῦ χαλκοῦ <τῷ παντὶ> τὸ μείζον πλήθος; uterque codicum scripturam τοῦ χαλκοῦ . . . παρέσχεν retinuit. Mihi vero in vocabulis τῷ μείζονι latere videtur τῷ μείζον εἶναι, ut Plutarchus scripserit: ὄνομα τὸν χαλκὸν τῷ μείζον εἶναι τὸ πλήθος παρασχεῖν: aes, quod maior esset eius copia, metallis illis commixtis nomen dedisse.

C. 3, pag. 395F. φησὶ τοίνυν (sc. Aristoteles) τῶν μὲν ἄλλων ὑγρῶν ἐπιόντα διέχειν ἀδήλως καὶ διασπείρεσθαι τὸν ἰόν, ἀνωμάτων . . . καὶ μανῶν ὄντων· τοῦ δὲ ἐλαίου τῇ πυκνότητι στέγεσθαι καὶ διαμένειν ἀθροίζμενον.

Reiske lacunam 8 litterarum post

ἀνωμάτων supplevit τῶν πόρων, minus recte, ut opinor. Oleum enim in eo differt a ceteris liquoribus, quod *particulae* eius aequaliores sunt, cf. Plut. *Quaest. Conv.*, pag. 696B: οὐ γὰρ ἔχει (sc. τὸ ἔλαιον) μεταξὺ τῶν ξηρῶν καὶ γεωδῶν ἐν αὐτῷ μερῶν κενώματα καὶ πόρους, *ibid.*, pag. 702B: ὅθεν οὐδὲ τῷ ἀέρι δίδωσιν ἀνάμειξιν (sc. τὸ ἔλαιον), ἀλλ' ἀποστατεῖ διὰ λεπτότητα τῶν μορίων καὶ συνέχειαν, ὥστε κ.τ.λ. Itaque suppleatur τῶν μορίων vel τῶν μερῶν.

C. 4, pag. 396B. Diogenianus ad peculiarem aeris colorem explicandum non opus esse contendit et crassitudine aeris Delphici et tenuitate: alteram utram satis esse: ἡ γὰρ λεπτότης, ἔφη, δόξει μὲν ὑπεναντιοῦσθαι [καὶ] πρὸς τὴν λεγομένην πυκνότητα τοῦ ἀέρος, λαμβάνεται δὲ οὐκ ἀναγκαίως· αὐτὸς γὰρ ἐφ' ἑαυτοῦ (Abresch, *diss.* Leid., 1878, pag. 9; codd. ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ) παλαιούμενος ὁ χαλκὸς ἀποπνεῖ καὶ μεθίησι τὸν ἰόν, ὃν ἡ πυκνότης συνέχουσα καὶ παχνοῦσα ποιεῖ ἐκφανῆ διὰ πλήθος.

Paton jure offensus in hiatu ποιεῖ ἐκφανῆ, minus recte proposuit ποιεῖ <πάλιν> ἐκφανῆ. Leniore medicina usus lege καταφανῆ.

C. 7, pag. 397B. ἡμεῖς δὲ, ὦ Βόηθε, καὶν ἢ φαυλότερα τῶν Ὀμήρου ταῦτα τὰ ἔπη, μὴ νομίζωμεν αὐτὰ πεποιηκῆναι τὸν θεόν, ἀλλὰ κ.τ.λ.

Post φαυλότερα Wytttenbach supplevit καὶν βελτίονα, Paton καὶν κομψότερα. Neutrum mihi placet, praesertim cum lacunam libri MSS. nullam indicent.

Lenius Bernadacis $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\ \eta\ <\kappa\alpha\upsilon\ \mu\eta\ \eta\ >$. Ego, quo magis lectionem traditam sequar, conjecerim $\kappa\alpha\upsilon\ <\mu\eta\ >\ \eta$.

Paulo infra legendum censeo: $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho\ \epsilon\iota\ \gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\epsilon\upsilon\iota\ \epsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\ \mu\eta\ <\delta\epsilon\ >\ \lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\iota\iota\ \<\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ >\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \chi\rho\eta\sigma\mu\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ .\ .\ .\ \kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\iota\alpha\ (Abresch, diss. Leid. pag. 41; codd. \kappa\alpha\lambda\lambda\iota\gamma\rho\acute{\alpha}\phi\iota\alpha).$ Voce $\alpha\upsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma$ denotantur dei ministrae, $\pi\rho\omicron\phi\eta\tau\iota\delta\epsilon\varsigma$, quarum paulo supra mentio facta est.

C. 7, pag. 397C. $\delta\eta\lambda\omicron\varsigma\ \gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho\ \epsilon\iota\ (\omega\ \beta\omicron\eta\theta\epsilon)\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \upsilon\pi\omicron\phi\epsilon\rho\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omicron\varsigma$.

Vocabula $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\varsigma$ corrupta sunt. Ex iis enim, qui huic dialogo intersunt, nemo ad Epicureorum praecepta inclinat vel eius sectae fautor est. Itaque lege $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma$. De $\kappa\alpha\iota$ et $\pi\rho\delta\varsigma$ inter se confusis, cf. Cobet, *Var. Lectt.*, pag. 272.

C. 7, pag. 397D. Diogenianus cur Pythia, quae tunc esset, pedestri oratione oracula ederet, quaerens, $\omicron\upsilon\delta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho$, inquit, $\epsilon\varsigma\tau\iota\upsilon\ \epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\eta\omega\upsilon\upsilon$, $\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\upsilon\kappa\ \alpha\iota\tau\iota\alpha\upsilon\ \epsilon\pi\iota\zeta\eta\tau\epsilon\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\upsilon\ \pi\acute{\omega}\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\epsilon}\pi\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \tau\omicron\ \mu\alpha\upsilon\tau\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \epsilon\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$ (Madvig, *Adv. Crit.* I. pag. 636; codd. $\lambda\omicron\gamma\omicron\iota\varsigma$) $\chi\rho\acute{\omega}\mu\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon$.

$\epsilon\lambda\lambda\eta\eta\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ Bernadacis et Paton ediderunt recepta Stegmanni conjectura. Reiske, item Abresch, quem Reiskii correctio fugisse videtur, pro codicum scriptura ($\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\eta\lambda\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ E, $\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omega\upsilon\upsilon$ B) proposuerunt $\alpha\upsilon\theta\rho\omega\pi\omega\upsilon\upsilon$, quod quanto Stegmanni conjecturae praestet, nemo non videbit.

C. 9, pag. 398E. $\tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\iota\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\ \pi\rho\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\phi\alpha\tau\alpha\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \nu\epsilon\alpha\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\theta\eta\ \pi\epsilon\rho\iota\ \tau\epsilon\ \text{Κύμην} \kappa\alpha\iota\ \text{Δικαιάρχειαν} \omicron\upsilon\chi\ \upsilon\mu\omicron\upsilon\mu\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\ \pi\acute{\alpha}\lambda\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \acute{\alpha}\delta\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\alpha\ \delta\iota\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omega\upsilon\ \text{Σιβυλλείων} \omicron\ \chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \omicron\pi\omicron\epsilon\rho\ \omicron\phi\epsilon\iota\lambda\omega\upsilon\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\delta\epsilon\delta\omega\kappa\epsilon\upsilon$, $\epsilon\kappa\rho\eta\zeta\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \pi\upsilon\rho\delta\varsigma\ \omicron\rho\epsilon\iota\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \zeta\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \theta\alpha\lambda\alpha\sigma\sigma\acute{\iota}\alpha\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \pi\epsilon\tau\rho\omega\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \phi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\omicron\upsilon\omega\upsilon\ \upsilon\pi\omicron\ \pi\upsilon\epsilon\upsilon\mu\alpha\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\alpha\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\phi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\tau.\lambda.$

Quid sint $\phi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\omicron\upsilon\omega\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\alpha\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\phi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$ haud facile quis expediat. $\phi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\mu\omicron\upsilon\eta$ enim, quod vocabulum medicinae artis proprium est, valet *inflammationem*, metaphorice *perturbationem*. Suspicio Plutarchum scripsisse: $\pi\epsilon\tau\rho\omega\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\alpha\phi\lambda\epsilon\gamma\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omega\upsilon\ \alpha\upsilon\alpha\rho\rho\acute{\iota}\phi\epsilon\iota\varsigma$, quibuscum verbis conferas Plin. *Epist.* vi. 16: Tum navibus cinis incidebat . . . iam pumices etiam nigrique et ambusti et fracti igne lapides.

C. 10, pag. 399A. $\text{Σίβυλλαι} \delta' \alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\iota\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \text{Βάκιδες} \omicron\pi\omicron\epsilon\rho\ \epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \pi\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \alpha\tau\epsilon\kappa\mu\acute{\alpha}\rho\tau\omega\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \chi\rho\acute{\omicron}\nu\omicron\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\epsilon}\beta\alpha\lambda\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \delta\iota\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\pi\epsilon\iota\rho\alpha\upsilon$, $\omicron\varsigma$

$\epsilon\tau\upsilon\chi\epsilon$, παντοδαπῶν ὀνόματα καὶ ῥήματα παθῶν καὶ συμπτωμάτων· οἷς γιγνομένων ἐνίων ἀπὸ τύχης ὁμοίως ψεῦδός ἐστι τὸ νῦν λεγόμενον, $\kappa\alpha\upsilon$ (Leon, codd. $\kappa\alpha\iota$) ὕστερον ἀληθές (Emper, codd. ἀληθῶς) εἰ τύχοι, γένηται.

Posteriorem huius sententiae partem vitio laborare multi viderunt neque tamen apposite emendaverunt. Legatur: $\omicron\upsilon\ \gamma\epsilon\omicron\mu\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omega\upsilon$ (codd. $\gamma\iota\omicron\mu\omicron\mu\epsilon\upsilon\omega\upsilon$) $\epsilon\upsilon\iota\omega\upsilon\ .\ .\ .\ \omicron\mu\omicron\varsigma\ \psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, vel cum Reiskio $\psi\epsilon\upsilon\delta\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$: *e quibus, quamquam nonnulla forte fortuna evenerunt, tamen mendacium (vel falsum) est, quidquid nunc praedicatur, etiamsi postea verum esse probatur.*

C. 11, pag. 399E. $\omicron\upsilon\ \gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho\ \omicron\iota\mu\acute{\alpha}\iota\ \tau\iota\upsilon\alpha\ \epsilon\rho\epsilon\iota\upsilon\ \omicron\tau\iota\ \mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\ \omicron\varsigma\ \pi\rho\epsilon\rho\rho\eta\theta\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\upsilon$.

Pro $\mu\epsilon\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\upsilon\ \omicron\varsigma\ \text{Paton}$ in textum recepit $\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \mu\epsilon\tau\rho\alpha\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \omicron\varsigma$, quae viri doctissimi conjectura minime mihi placet. In proximis enim nulla mentio facta est de numeris atque rythmis oraculorum; verum, cum Serapio id agat ut exemplis quam maximis Boetho probet oracula non fortuito evenire, sed re vera futura praedicere, minime dubito quin Plutarchus scripserit: $\omicron\tau\iota\ \mu\epsilon\upsilon\ \tau\alpha\upsilon\tau\alpha$ (*i.e.* res priore capitis parte memoratae) $\omicron\upsilon\tau\omega\varsigma\ \omicron\varsigma\ \pi\rho\epsilon\rho\rho\eta\theta\eta\ \sigma\upsilon\upsilon\acute{\nu}\epsilon\pi\epsilon\sigma\epsilon\ \kappa\alpha\tau\acute{\alpha}\ \tau\acute{\upsilon}\chi\eta\upsilon$.

C. 12, pag. 400A. $\epsilon\iota\pi\acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omicron\varsigma\ \delta\epsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \text{Σεραπίωνος} \omicron\tau\iota\ \tau\eta\upsilon\ \epsilon\xi\ \upsilon\gamma\rho\omega\upsilon\ \eta\eta\acute{\iota}\xi\alpha\tau\omicron\ \tau\rho\omicron\phi\eta\upsilon\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \gamma\acute{\epsilon}\nu\epsilon\sigma\iota\upsilon\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\alpha\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\iota\upsilon\ \omicron\ \delta\eta\mu\iota\omicron\upsilon\rho\gamma\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\epsilon\iota\tau\epsilon\ \kappa\tau.\lambda.$

Vox $\alpha\upsilon\alpha\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$, *exhalatio*, *vapores emissi*, vix sana est. In promptu est corrigere $\epsilon\xi\ \alpha\upsilon\alpha\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\epsilon\omega\varsigma$ collatis quae apud Plutarchum leguntur *de Stoic. Rep.* pag. 1053A, nisi quis offensus in verborum ordine legere mavult $\kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\alpha\phi\iota\upsilon$, ut paulo infra: $\upsilon\pi\omicron\beta\acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\tau\rho\epsilon\mu\alpha\ \tau\omicron\phi\ \lambda\omicron\gamma\omega\ \tau\acute{\alpha}\varsigma\ \alpha\upsilon\alpha\phi\epsilon\iota\varsigma\ \kappa\alpha\iota\ \alpha\upsilon\alpha\theta\upsilon\mu\acute{\iota}\alpha\sigma\iota\varsigma$.

C. 12, pag. 400D. Lege: $\epsilon\gamma\omega\gamma\epsilon$, $\epsilon\iota\pi\omicron\text{N}$ (codd. Bernad., Paton: $\epsilon\iota\pi\epsilon\upsilon$) $\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\ \eta\lambda\acute{\iota}\omicron\upsilon\ \tau\eta\upsilon\ \sigma\epsilon\lambda\eta\eta\eta\upsilon$. Philini enim sunt verba, qui Basilocli refert quae cum Diogeniano hospite amici disputaverint. Paulo infra, c. 13, pag. 400D, cum Kurtzio, *B. ph.* IV., 1894, pag. 1125, legendum censeo: $\acute{\alpha}\pi\omicron\rho\acute{\iota}\alpha\ \delta\epsilon\ \alpha\iota\tau\iota\alpha\varsigma$, $\epsilon\mu\omicron\iota\ \gamma\omicron\upsilon\delta\iota\ \delta\omicron\kappa\epsilon\iota\text{N}$, $\sigma\iota\omega\pi\omega\acute{\iota}\omega\tau\omega\upsilon\ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\omega\upsilon\ \kappa\tau.\lambda.$

C. 16, pag. 401F. ($\lambda\acute{\epsilon}\gamma\epsilon\tau\alpha\iota$) $\tau\omicron\upsilon\ \text{Κροῖσον} .\ .\ .\ \tau\omicron\phi\ \theta\epsilon\acute{\omicron}\ \tau\eta\upsilon\ \chi\acute{\alpha}\rho\iota\upsilon\ \alpha\mu\epsilon\iota\phi\alpha\sigma\theta\alpha\iota\ \tau\eta\varsigma\ \gamma\upsilon\upsilon\upsilon\alpha\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma$, $\epsilon\upsilon\ \gamma\epsilon\ \pi\omicron\iota\omicron\upsilon\upsilon\tau\alpha\ \epsilon\kappa\epsilon\iota\omega\upsilon$, $\omicron\theta\epsilon\upsilon$,

εἶπεν, ἄξιον δὴ κ.τ.λ. Pro ὅθεν lege ὁ Θέων et verba εἰ γε ποιούντα a praecedentibus disjunge, quod Wyttenbach iam monuit.

C. 19, pag. 403F. Theopompus qui aequalibus comprobare vult, sua quoque aetate oracula numeris composita Pythiam edere παντάπασιν ὀλίγων χρησμάτων ὑπόρρηκεν, ὡς τῶν ἄλλων καὶ τότε καταλογάδην ἐκφερομένων.

Pro τῶν ἄλλων, quod minus recte opponatur vocabulo ὀλίγων, recte restituit v. Herwerden, Plut. et Luc., pag. 15 τῶν πολλῶν.

C. 20, pag. 403F. "Ενιοι (sc. χρησμοὶ) δὲ καὶ νῦν μετὰ μέτρων ἐκτρέχουσιν, ὧν ἕνεκα καὶ πρᾶγμα περιβόητον πεποίηκεν.

Pro verbis ὧν ἕνεκα καὶ Paton scripsit ὧν ἓνα ἢ κακία παράγουσα, ingeniosius, mea quidem sententia, quam verius; Wyttenbach conjecit ὧν ἓνα καὶ πρᾶγμα, quem Bernadacis secutus proposuit ὧν ἓνα καὶ τι πρᾶγμα. Mihi vero in KAKAI latere videtur KAINONTI, et noster scripsisse ὧν ἓνα καὶ ὧν τι πρᾶγμα, ut sensus sit: *e quibus unum (oraculum) res admodum nova notissimum reddidit*, quae sententia optime iis quae sequuntur convenit.

C. 27, pag. 407F. "Ιστε (Reiske, codd. εἰς) γὰρ τὸν Χίον . . . ἄλλους τε πολλοὺς ἡγεμόνας στολῶν ὅσοις ἔδει τεκμηρίους ἀνευρεῖν τὴν . . . ἰδρυσιν· ὧν ἐνιοι καὶ

διημάρτανον, ὥσπερ Βάττος. ἔλεξε γὰρ ἐκπεσεῖν οὐ καταλαβὼν ἐφ' ὃν ἐπέμφθη τόπον· εἶτα ἦκε δεύτερον ποτνιώμενος.

Vocabulum ἔλεξε corruptum esse nemo non vidit. Quod autem Reiske proposuit ἔδοξε, id, quamquam artis palaeographicae rationibus optime defenditur, minus tamen sententiae convenit, quod ipse vidit vir doctissimus, quippe qui ἐκπεσεῖν in ἐψεύσθαι vel ἐξηπατήσθαι mutandum censuerit. Neque quae Paton conjecit mihi placeat. Fortiore quadam medicina usus, lege ἔλπιδος γὰρ ἐξέπεσεν: *spe enim dejectus est*. Id certe optime congruit cum Batti casibus quibus in enarrandis Plutarchus maxima e parte Cyrenaeos secutus est, cf. Herod. iv. 154-157.

C. 29, pag. 408F. ἢ δὲ τῆς Πυθίας διάλεκτος . . . εὐθεία πρὸς τὴν ἀλήθειαν οὔσα, πρὸς δὲ πίστιν ἐπισφαλῆς καὶ ὑπεύθυνος οὐδένα καθ' αὐτῆς ἐλεγχον ἄχρι νῦν παράδεδωκεν. Nil opus est Madvigii conjectura, Adv. Crit., I. pag. 637, ἀνεπισφαλῆς. Sensus loci, quem supra laudavi, hic est: Pythiae sermo, etsi facile fidem, quam homines in eo ponunt, amittere potest, semperque rationi reddendae obnoxius est, nullam tamen usque ad hoc tempus facultatem sui accusandi dedit.

J. H. W. STRIJD.

Amersfoort, Holland.

A FEW NOTES ON THE TEXT OF MARCUS AURELIUS.

I. 5. It is not known whom Marcus meant by τροφέως. Possibly the name has dropped out. He is generally identified with the educator mentioned in Capit. Vit. Pii x. § 5: 'Cum Marcus mortuum educatorem suum fleret vocareturque ab aulicis ministris ab ostentatione pietatis, ipse dixerit, "Permittite," inquit, "illi ut homo sit; neque enim vel philosophia vel imperium tollit adfectus." If the identification is correct, the τροφεὺς of Marcus must have died about 139. But it has not been noticed that Aristides in his funeral oration over Alexander of Cotiaeum (Jebb § 148) says of him: γηγόμενος τοῖνυν ἐπ' ἐξουσίας καὶ δυνάμεως

τοσαύτης ὥστε καὶ τροφέως χώραν οὐχὶ διδασκάλου μόνον τῶν παίδων (i.e. Marcus and Lucius) ἔχειν. We know from Aristides that he was at Rome in 145 and residing at the Palace. But as he is the Alexander the Grammarian mentioned I. 10 it does not seem likely that he was meant by τροφέως.

III. 16, § 2 τὰ λοιπὰ κοινά. The word λοιπά comes awkwardly with λοιπὸν following so soon, and τοιαῦτα would seem a possible substitution. In the preceding lines certain persons are ambiguously referred to as 'disbelievers in Gods, traitors to their country and doers (of unnameable deeds) when the doors are shut.' Marcus sums them up in the curious

neuter τὰ εἰρημένα. The three stock charges against the Christians were that they were atheists, men without patriotism, and guilty of incest and cannibalism. It is impossible not to believe that they are referred to here. If so, the accepted view of the attitude of this Emperor towards the Christians must be revised, for he admits that such persons, as are alluded to, τὸν νοῦν ἡγέμονα ἔχουσι ἐπὶ τὰ φαινόμενα καθήκοντα. Compare again VII. 28, where he speaks of those 'who can live out their lives in the utmost peace of mind, even though all the world cry out against them what they choose, and the beasts tear them limb-meal.' He cannot be thinking of ordinary criminals, for the persons mentioned are obviously innocent people wrongfully ill-treated. Again VIII. 51, he quotes the indignant cry of whom but the Christians?—They kill us, they cut us limb from limb, they execrate us—adding: 'How does that prevent you from being pure, sane, sober, just?' But, we shall be told, in XI. 3, he distinctly mentions the Christians with disapproval. No doubt he is there glancing at the Christians, but nevertheless the words ὡς οἱ Χριστιανοὶ must I think, be a gloss. They are quite ungrammatical, and have the precise form that a marginal note would take. Moreover the word παράταξις, persistently translated 'obstinacy,' according to the usage of Marcus and of Lucian¹ means 'opposition,' not 'obstinacy.' Very instructive is another passage, if, as I think quite possible, Marcus has the Christians in his eye: Μέμνησο ὅτι ἀκαταμάχητον γίνεται τὸ ἡγεμονικόν ὅταν εἰς ἑαυτὸ συστραφέν ἄρκεσθῇ ἑαυτῷ, μὴ ποιοῦν τι ὃ μὴ θέλει, καὶ ἀλόγως παρατάξεται. Such opposition does not meet with his entire disapproval. In fact conduct such as that of the martyrs is exactly what Marcus is never tired of commending—not under any compulsion to transgress the demands of the ruling Reason, and if it be found impossible to act up to the standard of right set by the conscience owing to external things, then to depart cheerfully from life. This was a cardinal

doctrine of the Stoic creed. What Marcus does disapprove of is the Christian habit of rushing on death (as he deemed it) without due consideration or dignity and too theatrically. Another reason for thinking the word Χριστιανοὶ a gloss is that the term was a barbarism, and as such tabu with the literary purists, of whom Marcus was undoubtedly one. It is eschewed by Epictetus, Dio Chrysostom, Plutarch, Aristides, Galen, Apuleius, Dio Cassius and Philostratus, even where they are apparently speaking of Christians. Lucian uses the word in his *Alexander* and *Peregrinus*, if those pieces are by him.

IV. 3 § 3. τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῖν δοκούντων. This, the reading of the MSS., is corrected by Gataker to τῶν εὐφημῶν δοκούντων. It is worth while suggesting τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν or τῶν ἐφ' ἡμῶν <εὐφημῶν>.

IV. 33. Here, in the citation of Roman heroes, Δέντατος for Λεοννάτος (Wyse) has won wide acceptance. Why not also Οὐαλέριος for Οὐόλεσος, seeing that Volesus was the Sabine ancestor of the Valerii?

V. 6 § 2. εὖ ποιήσας. The following ἕτερον suggests the possibility of ἐν having fallen out before εὖ, whereas in X. 8 § 3 ἐν γε τοῦτο would read better as εὖ γε τοῦτο.

V. 12 *ad fin.* χέση. A reference to the rather disgusting story in Diog. Laert. *Diog.* § 6 (repeated in *Arist.* § 4) might seem to suggest πτύση as a possible emendation for χέση.

V. 36. διὰ τοῦτ' οὖν. Perhaps διὰ τούτους gives more point to the taunt.

V. 36. ἐπεὶ τοι γίνῃ. This passage is given up by Stich and Schenkl, and a satisfactory emendation seems hopeless. But ἔπειτα τί seems likely for ἐπεὶ τοι.

VI. 16 § 4. ἐπὶ τί (or τὸ P.) σπεύδουσιν. Couat has suggested τοῦτο, but τοῦτ' accounts better for the MS. reading. I think this form is found once in Marcus, and has been introduced into the text of V. 3 by Radermacher, and of VIII. 44 by Leopold.

VII. 24. ὅταν πολλάκις ἐναποθνήσκειν ᾗ τὸ πρόσχημα. Schenkl abandons this passage as beyond cure. As an attempt to patch it up, I would suggest ὃ ὅταν

¹ Marcus III. 3; VIII. 48. Lucian *Quom. Histor.*, §§ 45, 49.

πολλάκις ἐνῆ, ἀποθνῆσκει δὲ (ἥδη) τὸ πρόσχημα.

VIII. 31. εἶτα ἐπιθι τὰς ἄλλας. Schenkl would understand αὐλὰς, and marks a lacuna, a favourite resource of his. Could τὸν ὅλης φυλῆς stand, with Lofft's *μηκέθ' ἑνός* to follow?

VIII. 41 *ad fin.* ἀπτεται, ὅταν γένηται σφαῖρος κυκλοτερὴς μένει. Rendall suggests *μονίη* (cp. XII. 3), and there is justice in his objection to the pointlessness of the received reading; but the words make a *senarius* if we substitute *σφαῖρα* (cp. VIII. 20, XI. 12) for *σφαῖρος*, and *μενεῖ* for *μένει* will perhaps slightly improve the sense. To obviate the want of a connecting particle after ὅταν, a dash must be placed after ἀπτεται.

XI. 21. ἐνεργείας ἀπόληξις, ὁρμῆς, ὑπολήψεως παύλα. Richards suggests the loss of a substantive after ὁρμῆς, and the symmetry of the sentence appears to require it. Would ἀπόληψις answer the purpose?

IX. 30 *ad fin.* τὸ σύμπαν. Is this not rather too sweeping a negative? If so, *τοιούτον* may be the true reading.

XI. 11. εἰ μὲν οὐκ. Read εἰ μὲν οὐν <μή>.

XI. 18 *ad fin.* ἀσθενούς (ἀσθενεῖ A). A comparison with XI. 9 would suggest ἀσθενές = 'a weak thing,' a 'weakness.'

XI. 20. πνευμάτιον. Why not πνευματικόν, as in IV. 4?

XI. 26. τῶν Ἐφεσίων. Schenkl does not admit Gataker's drastic emendation Ἐπικουρείων (cp. Sen. *Ep.* XI. 8). Could Ἐφέσιοι mean the followers of Heraclitus? Or would τοῦ Ἐφεσίου stand as a designation of that philosopher?

XI. 34. οὐδὲν δύσφημον, ἔφη, ἀλλά. For ἀλλά we might recall ὄνομα from Epictetus III. 24. 88.

XII. 2. καθαρμάτων. This word is out of keeping with ἀγγείων and φλοιῶν. Perhaps *καλυμμάτων*.

XII. 36. πέντε ἔτεσιν <ἢ τρισί>. The two last words are added by Reiske, but would not εἰκόσιν be more likely to fall out after ἔτεσιν?

C. R. HAINES.

Mazagon, Godalming.

SOME NOTES ON THE HOMERIC HYMNS.

Hymn to Apollo, 402.

τῶν δ' οὐτις κατὰ θυμὸν ἐπεφράσατο νοῆσαι.

SUCH is the reading of M. For οὐτις the whole of the remaining MSS. have ὅς τις, and for ἐπεφράσατο, D has ἐπεφράσσατο, the *x* family ἐπιφράσσατο, the *p* family ἐπιφράσσαιτο. Allen-Sikes adopt the readings ὅς τις . . . ἐπιφράσσαιτο, which 'can mean 'whoever thought to observe the dolphin.' The sense, however, is not very good: it is not obvious why Apollo (the dolphin) should resent inspection, though in view of the lacuna which probably follows this must not be pressed. But the reading of *p* looks like a correction of the metre rather than a genuine reading, and this suspicion is strengthened by the combined readings of M, D, and the rest of *x*. Is it not likely that, details apart, the indicative was read in the

common ancestor of our MSS.? Then, of course, correction is needed. I suggest that the original reading was, οὐτις . . . ἐπεφράσαθ' ὥστε νοῆσαι, meaning, roughly: 'no thought occurred to anyone leading him to recognise (the dolphin as Apollo).' This seems at least better sense. The trouble probably arose in an uncial MS.

Hymn to Hermes, 41.

ἔνθ' ἀναπηλήσας γλυφάνω πολιοῖο
σιδήρου
αἰὼν' ἐξετόρησεν.

ἀναπηλήσας seems to defy explanation successfully: it is retained in the Oxford text (= *cum convertisset*), but this rendering is probably a guess, since the sense of the participle (see Allen-Sikes' note) is so uncertain. Of the conjectures Barnes' ἀναπηδήσας is graphically the simplest, but is stultified by the previous

line: Hermann's ἀναπιλήσας—as the editors very justly remark—is quite inapplicable to a tortoise.

Does not αἰῶνα in l. 42 limit the range of meaning of the participle? It clearly means marrow, pulp; and this could hardly be used of a *complete* tortoise. Therefore ἀναπιλήσας (or whatever word it conceals) should indicate some action which renders the tortoise a mere mass of pulp or jelly. I suggest ἀναπηρώσας should be read. This gives excellent sense: Hermes first maims the tortoise (cutting off its head and feet), and then scoops out the shapeless mass left in the shell. Graphically, perhaps the supposed corruption, ρω into λη, is not very easy, unless we can assume that both letters were very hastily written, which would make a mistake possible.

The only other use of ἀναπηρώω I can find is in Plato, *Polit.* 310 E.

Hymn to Hermes, 188.

ἔνθα γέροντα
κνώδαλον εὔρε νέμοντα παρέξ ὁδοῦ, ἔρκος
ἀλωῆς.

κνώδαλον is not in the least likely to be a corruption, and doubtless means 'his ox or his ass' (Allen-Sikes); νέμοντα seems to be adequately covered by κνώδαλον. But ἔρκος ἀλωῆς very naturally defies explanation. It cannot be in opposition to κνώδαλον in imitation of the Homeric ἔρκος Ἀχαιῶν: only a watch-dog could reasonably be so called, since a vineyard cannot be ploughed. A very simple correction will put the matter straight if we read παρ' ἐξοδον ἔρκεος αὐλῆς. There is no reason for the old man to be still in his vineyard: rather, it being early morning, he might reasonably be found near his house 'grazing his beast along the way which led out from his courtyard.' The corruption of ἔρκεος αὐλῆς to ἔρκος ἀλωῆς might easily result from memory of the ending of l. 87.

Hymn to Hermes, 346.

αὐτὸς οὗτος ὅδ' ἐκτός, ἀμήχανος.

Correction is obviously necessary. The Oxford text accepts Bothe's ὁ δεκτός, which is explained by Allen-Sikes

as 'receptive, sc. thievish (as δέκτης of a beggar, δ. 248).' That δεκτός does not otherwise occur until the period of N.T. Greek is not in itself to be taken too seriously, but it is an important objection that in the N.T. δεκτός has its root meaning, accepted, acceptable. To call Hermes 'receptive' is weak and most inappropriate to the brisk narrative of the passage.

Possibly the order has been affected, following on some slight corruption: one might think of the true reading as being:

αὐτὸς δ' ἐκτός ὁδοῦ, τις ἀμήχανος.

If so, the corruption must have arisen in the passing from uncial to minuscule script. The minuscule scribe finding before him the group ΑΤΤΟCΔΕΚΤΟCΟΔΟΤΤΙC might easily fall into a trap and read αὐτὸς δ' ἐκτός ὁδ' οὔτος; and he or a successor would seek to smooth over the difficulty as far as possible by changing the order to that of the MSS.

The only objection seems to be that Hermes has not been walking outside the path—his sandals being sufficient disguise. There may be an immaterial misstatement on the part of Apollo; or can ἐκτός ὁδοῦ mean 'without walking in the usual way'? The sequel οὐτ' ἄρα ποσσίν, etc., rather suggests this.

For τις ἀμήχανος cp. ρ 499. τις θαρσαλέος.

Hymn to Hestia (xxiv.), 4.

ἐπέρχεο θυμὸν ἔχουσα.

If the MSS. are right a lacuna is necessary, but such an assumption is objectionable in so short a hymn. Tucker's neat alteration ἐν' ἔρχεο is accepted in the Oxford text; but it is perhaps a pity to sacrifice the intensive ἐπέρχεο. May not θυμὸν ἔχουσα be a corruption of θῦμα λαχοῦσα = πῖαρ ἐλοῦσα (*Arphrodite*, 30)?

Hymn to Hestia (xxix.) 8 ff. Allen-Sikes mark a lacuna after line 9; there is, of course, no real objection to *valere* following σν, as the editors remark. But, even with a lacuna after line 9, the transition back to the singular, ἱλαος ὦν, seems intolerable. That the order of the lines has been disturbed seems

almost certain, and Martin placed l. 9 after l. 11. To this change, however, there are serious objections which are remarked by the editors, notably the asyndeton of the clause *ἔργματα*, and the connection of *δῶματα* with *ἀνθρώπων*. It seems preferable to put l. 9 after l. 10, with a full stop at the end of l. 10, changing *Ἔστίη* to *εἰδότες* in l. 11. *Ἔστίη* may have been substituted because *εἰδότες* occurred in the same position in l. 12.

There is no palæographic explanation of the apparent inversion of ll. 9-10

(unless l. 10 was first omitted, then added in the margin of a MS., and, finally, wrongly placed by a copyist too mechanical to think of the sense of what he was writing); yet even so pure accidents do happen, even in copying MSS.

If this arrangement is right, Groddeck's view that the occasion of the hymn was the dedication of a joint temple of Hermes and Hestia seems more definitely established.

HUGH G. EVELYN WHITE.

AITNAIOI KANΘΑΠΟΙ.

EVERYONE remembers the Aetnaean beetle on which Trygaeus mounted to Olympus, but it is not so generally realized that it is also a source of mystification. The Alexandrians had carefully collected parallels from Epicharmus, Aeschylus, Sophocles, and Plato Comicus in order to explain the allusion; and though we ought to congratulate ourselves on the good fortune of their preservation, we may suspect that they have actually confused the issue. Let us see what the interpreters have to say, starting from the scholia. There are three alternatives: (1) A big beetle, because Aetna was a big mountain. This is almost a literal paraphrase of Plato's joke (fr. 37, I. 610 K.): *ὡς μέγα μέντοι πάνυ τὴν Αἴτνην ὄρος εἶναι φασὶ τεκμαίρου | ἔνθα τρέφεσθαι τὰς κανθαρίδας τῶν ἀνθρώπων λόγος ἐστὶν | οὐδὲν ἐλάττους* ('Judge how big Aetna must be, where they tell us the beetles are as big as men'). 'Who drives fat oxen should himself be fat!' And yet it is adopted by Blaydes in sober earnest. (2) Aetnaean, because a peculiar kind of (large) beetle is found there. The fact is established by the evidence of natives (Epicharmus), or of one who was as good as a native (Aeschylus). Sophocles and Plato show that they were big. We will leave this for the moment and pass to (3): Aetnaean, because Aetnaean (Sicilian) horses were a famous breed. For the last-mentioned fact, which is

notorious, the scholiast quotes Pind. fr. 102. Now this is a learned note, worthy of all respect, although after successive redactions, it perhaps bears a different aspect than when first composed by Didymus. But I imagine that, if the situation in the *Pax* were considered without any of the prejudice imported from the scholia, no one would hesitate to plump for the third view. 'My master has put in the stable an Arabian-beetle.'¹ Yet Van Leeuwen and Mr. Graves are alone in taking this course at all hazards. Dr. Rogers is very decisively on the other side: 'The passages which they [the scholl.] cite . . . are conclusive in favour of the third [our second] interpretation' [*i.e.* 'that there was in fact some species of large beetle called the Aetnaean, probably from being found in the neighbourhood of that mountain']. Dr. Merry and Mr. Sharpley are inclined to hedge, apparently agreeing with the view expressed by Jebb on *O.C.* 312: 'In *Ar. Pax* 73 the *Αἰτναῖος μέγιστος κανθαρος* is not a mere joke on the Etna breed of horses, but alludes to a species of beetle actually found there.' These critics have not observed that zoological accuracy would have blunted the none too keen edge of the witticism. It was reserved for O. Crusius, in one of his masterly notes on the *Paroemio-*

¹ So Mr. Sharpley. But the joke is impossible in English, as will appear.

graphi (*Philol. suppl.* vi. 291 f.), to show that Aristophanes did not invent the joke, but inherited it from Epicharmus (fr. 76 K.): <ὁ> Πυγμαρίων λοχαγὸς ἐκ τῶν κανθάρων | τῶν μεζόνων, οὓς φαντι τὰν Αἰτναν ἔχειν. The occasion described was the attack of the Pygmies on the sleeping Heracles (*Philostr. imag.* 2. 22), —a scene which exactly corresponds with Gulliver's earliest adventure in Lilliput; and the leader of the Pygmies had just leapt from his war-chariot drawn by the big beetles that Aetna was said to rear. But I am surprised that Crusius did not draw the inference that the Αἰτναῖος κανθαρος is altogether a fabulous beast, the figment of Epicharmus' (or some other's) brain. For the starting point of the combination is simply the verbal similarity of κανθων (κανθήλιος) to κανθαρος, an instance of γέλως ἀπὸ τῆς λέξεως κατὰ παρωνυμίαν (*Kaibel, Com.* I. p. 51, Starkie's *Acharnians*, p. xlix, Rutherford, *Annotation*, p. 442). The point is driven home in Aristophanes by the grooming of the beetle, which is addressed as κανθων—a quasi-hypocoristic—by its master. Cf. Greg. *Cypr. Cod. Mosq.* 2. 24 Αἰτναῖον κανθωνα· τὸν μέγαν. Henceforward, Αἰτναῖος κανθαρος becomes part of the comedian's stock-in-trade, a ludicrous image apt to describe any fantastic, grotesque, and unfamiliar object. Aeschylus, in his satyric Σίουφος πετροκυλιστής (fr. 233), was perhaps the first to give currency at Athens to the Sicilian extravagance. Sisyphus, straining at his penal task, every limb extended against the weight of the rock, what is he but a huge Aetnaean beetle crawling up the mountain?¹ Sophocles, in his satyric *Daedalus* (fr. 165), where metre suggests that we should read ἀλλ' οὐδὲ μὲν δὴ κανθαρος | τῶν Αἰτναίων <γε> πάντως, presents a more enigmatic picture. But I believe that he was referring to the brazen giant Talos (λέγει δὲ πάντως εἰκάζων εἰς μέγαν, says the scholiast),

that masterpiece of Hephaestus' cunning, constructed with a single tube of life running from neck to ankle, whom Minos employed as a sentinel to exclude strangers from Crete. 'Well, he certainly isn't a beetle, not even an Aetnaean one. . . .' It is surely significant that all the four passages quoted to illustrate the *Pax* are also of a comic character; significant again, if every traveller knew of these beetles, that Plato should think it worth while to say that they were reported to be bigger than men; significant above all that the Sicilian Epicharmus should attribute their existence to hearsay.

Quite recently Oxyrhynchus has yielded another example, again from a satyric drama (*Soph. Ichneut.* 300), which, as I venture to think, entirely confirms our results. After several futile attempts by the satyrs to guess Cyllene's riddle concerning the beast which found a voice after death, they suggest the κεράστης κανθαρος Αἰτναῖος. 'Now you're almost exactly right,' replies Cyllene. Guessing can go no further; they have certainly succeeded in naming no less amazing a τέρας. The dialogue moves towards a climax of inept perplexity. The satyrs ask in one breath: 'Is he like a weasel or a leopard?' Then: 'Is he like a dog² or a crab?' No wonder that, when they come to the horned Aetnaean beetle, Cyllene gravely assures them they are right. As to κεράστης, I suppose it to be simply an added extravagance. A beast which spoke after death might be as dangerous to encounter as the κεράστης ὄφις of the Libyan desert.

Whether the scarabaeus, which appears on a coin of Aetna beneath a head of Silenus (*B.V. Head, Hist. Num.*² p. 131), has so much significance as has been claimed for it, is a question for numismatists to decide. But they should not be hampered by a false impression of the literary evidence.

A. C. PEARSON.

¹ I follow Hermann in making fr. 227 interrogative: ἀλλ' ἀρουραῖος τίς ἐστι σμίνθος ὧδ' ὑπερφυῆς; Here is the answer: <πῶς λέγεις;> Αἰτναῖός ἐστι κανθαρος βία πονῶν.

² ἰχνευτῇ (298), conjectured by Zielinski, is now acknowledged by Professor Hunt to be the reading of the papyrus.

THE PANATHENAIC SHIP OF HERODES ATTICUS.

(Philostratus, *Vitae Sophistarum*, II. v.)

PHILOSTRATUS, in describing the benefactions of Herodes Atticus to Athens, mentions his splendid celebration of the Panathenaic Games, when he fulfilled his promise of receiving the spectators in the Stadium with marble seats; the author then goes on to describe the route of the Panathenaic Ship, which bore the Peplos of Athena as its sail, and was moved by invisible mechanical power, as follows:

δραμεῖν δὲ τὴν ναῦν, οὐχ ὑποζυγίων ἀγόντων ἀλλ' ὑπγείοις μηχαναῖς ἐπολισθάνουσανο, ἐκ Κεραμεικοῦ δὲ ἄρσαν . . . ἀφεῖναι ἐπὶ τὸ 'Ελευσίνιον, καὶ περιβάλουνσαν αὐτὸ παραμεῖναι τὸ Πελασγικὸν κομιζομένην δὲ παρὰ τὸ Πύθιον ἐλθεῖν οἱ νῦν ὥρμισται· τὸ δὲ ἐπὶ θάτερα τοῦ Σταδίου νεὼς ἐπέχει τύχης καὶ ἀγαλμα ἐλεφάντινον.

The passage has usually been taken apart from its context, and quoted as evidence that this Panathenaic ship stood beside the Pythion: and the further inference has been drawn that by Pythion here must be meant, not the Pythion beside the Ilissus, but another Pythion close under the Acropolis, because Pausanias saw a Panathenaic ship beside the Areopagus. There is indeed no evidence that the two ships were identical; it is perhaps more probable that they were not, since it appears from this passage that it was the usual custom to carry the Peplos on a ship drawn by beasts; and that of Herodes was evidently of a special construction. But, quite apart from this question, the whole theory rests upon a mistranslation of Philostratus; this mistranslation has been emphasized by placing a comma after ἐλθεῖν; it runs thus: 'it passed the Pelasgikon, and then arrived in its course at the Pythion, where it now is anchored,' οἱ instead of οὗ being presumably explained by a sort of attraction. But, if we omit the comma, or place it after Πύθιον, the correct translation becomes obvious—'it was carried past the Pythion, and arrived at the place where

it now is anchored.' Where this place was the following words show—'and the other side of the Stadium is occupied by a temple of Fortune with an ivory statue.'

The whole context now becomes clear. It is a description of the monuments which Athens owed to Herodes; and Philostratus, who lived some time in Athens, must have been familiar with them. The chief thing was the magnificent Stadium with its marble seats. On one side of it was the temple of Fortune, also doubtless built by him, and on the other his wonderful Panathenaic ship. We know that his tomb was also in the same region. The route by which the ship was brought there is also clear. It started with the rest of the Panathenaic procession from the Ceramicus, rounded the Eleusinium, of which the site is still, unfortunately, uncertain, and so reached the Pelasgicon at the entrance of the Acropolis. Here doubtless the Peplos was removed from the ship and carried up to the Acropolis; it was impossible to take such a complicated and unwieldy structure any further up the hill. The ship was then taken past the Pythion on the Ilissus, and so to its place beside the Stadium, to be preserved there among the other monuments of Herodes' public-spirited munificence. It will be noticed that the Pythion is mentioned, like the Eleusinion and the Pelasgicon, merely as one of the things passed by the ship in its transit.

If the ship was identical with the one seen by Pausanias, we must suppose that it had not yet been moved to its position beside the Stadium at the time of Pausanias' visit to Athens. If so, we should have to admit that Philostratus is mistaken in his description of the route of the Panathenaic procession on this occasion. But his evidence as to the route of a procession, which took place nearly a hundred years before his time, does not evidently carry the same authority as his statement as to the position of a conspicuous object such

as this ship in the Athens of his own days.

The Philostratus passage has long been a puzzle to Athenian topographers, some of whom have given it up as an insoluble problem. But, with the straightforward translation now given, the difficulties disappear. I may add

that I have submitted the passage to my colleague, Professor Platt, merely as a question of language, and apart from any topographical considerations; and he assures me that, in his opinion, my translation is the only possible one.

ERNEST A. GARDNER.

LEGIONS AND AUXILIA.

It used to be said that, in the army of the Roman Empire, *auxilia* were attached to the various legions in more or less equal numbers and in more or less definite fashion. More recent writers seem to speak somewhat doubtfully or even to leave the matter unnoticed. It may be well to try to sum the main facts for readers of this *Review*. The conclusion to which I incline is, that legions and *auxilia* were connected, but not so individually as the old view supposed.

Proofs of some connection can be found in classical literature. Besides vague passages, such as Suet. *Tib.* 16 or Tac. *Ann.* iv. 5. 5, which, though often quoted, are ineffective, we have the well-known case of the *octo Batavorum cohortes, quartae decumae legionis auxilia* in A.D. 68, Tac. *Hist.* i. 59. These cohorts had apparently been sent with Legio XIV from Britain to a destination not precisely stated, but had got separated on the way, *discordia temporum*.¹ Besides this familiar instance, we have such evidence as the following: (1) *Hist.* i. 64 suggests a connection between the Legio I Italica and the Gaulish Ala Tauriana. (2) *Ann.* xiii. 35 records the transference to the East from Germania of an unnamed *legio cum equitibus alariis et peditatu cohortium* in A.D. 58—a good precedent for a trans-

ference in A.D. 68. (3) Several passages connect legions and *auxilia* significantly, e.g. *Hist.* i. 57, 79 (*tertia legio adiunctis auxiliis*), ii. 4, iv. 62, *Ann.* xii. 29, etc. It may be noted that these passages mention both cohorts and *alae*. If here and still more in the next paragraph cohorts are the more often named, that is because the Roman army included twice or three times as many cohorts as *alae*, not because (as one scholar has thought) the arrangement applied only to the former.

Five inscriptions give similar testimony. (1) One, from the later first century, a dedication to Hercules Saxanus, is set up by vexillaries of Legio XXI Rapax *et auxilia eorum, cohortes v.* (Dessau, 9120). (2) A second, of about A.D. 158, mentions the African Legio III Augusta *et auxilia eius* (D. 342). A third, from the Danubian wars of Marcus (about A.D. 170), alludes to the legions I Italica and IV Flavia *cum omnibus copiis auxiliorum* (D. 1111, cf. Domaszewski, *Neue Heidelberger Jahrb.* v. 117). A fourth, from Bonn, was put up by the Leg. I Minervia *cum auxiliis* in A.D. 231 (*CIL.* xiii. 8,017). The fifth, of about twenty years later, records vexillations of British and German legions *cum auxiliis earum* (D. 546). I do not know other examples of this turn of phrase, but it clearly is akin to those indicated in the preceding paragraph.

On the other hand, many facts show that the tie between legions and *auxilia* was not very close. *Auxilia* served in provinces where no legions were stationed. Where the two served together, there is no sign of any fixed numerical ratio. Agricola thought that

¹ The legion got as far as Dalmatia, and was perhaps on its way to the East. The assertion of M. Meyer (*Philologus*, xlvii. 660) that it has left tiles with its stamp in Dalmatia is wrong, and indeed very careless; the examples which he quotes are inscriptions on stone, most of which are plainly of much later date. No tile of Leg. XIV Gemina has been ever found in Dalmatia (see *CIL.* III. 13339 = 14023).

Ireland could be conquered and held *legione una et modicis auxiliis*, and the mere epithet shows that the number of auxiliaries might vary. Nor again is there any sign of tactical connection in the battle-order. One has only to contrast the arrangement outlined in *Hist.* ii. 24 with the more usual tactics of *Agr.* 35 or *Hist.* v. 16 to see that the relationship between a legion and its *auxilia* did not extend into the battle-line. Even administratively, the *auxilia* could be grouped apart; thus in A.D. 74 commanders of senatorial rank appear as *praefecti auxiliorum adversus Germanos* (D. 990, 991). Nor, lastly, was there any connection in permanent encampments. In not a few legionary fortresses the inscriptions give no hint of any beyond the smallest body of auxiliaries as stationed within the ramparts. At the most an *ala* occurs, as possibly at Novaesium—though Nissen's proof of that does not convince me—and at Delminium in Dalmatia (inland from Spalato), where the *ala nova Claudia* was seemingly quartered with the Seventh Legion in the first century. Among the many military inscriptions of our English Chester, only one can with any shred of probability be attributed to an auxiliary (my Catalogue, 66; compare the sculpture 137). To some extent the absence of 'auxiliary' tombstones may be due to the fact that the *auxilia* were less well paid and less well off than the legionaries. But it seems

plain that legionary fortresses housed, as a rule, few or no auxiliaries.

The explanation of these diverse evidences may best be found if we start from the undoubted fact, that the normal field-force in the Roman Empire was composed of legionary heavy infantry, supplemented by the various kinds of troops serving in the *auxilia*. So, too, the fortified posts of a fully garrisoned province were divided into the large legionary *hiberna* and the more numerous auxiliary *castella*. Tacitus, indeed, uses the phrase *legiones et auxilia* as a rhetorical alternative to *exercitus*, just as he puts *cohortes alaeque* for *auxilia* or *municipia et coloniae* for the Italian towns. The combination of the different kinds of troops was practically necessary for the various kinds of fighting and garrisoning, and it was thus needful—under normal conditions—to provide *auxilia* wherever legionaries went. Particularly, when a legion moved to new quarters, it had to take *auxilia* with it, unless (one may suppose) they were otherwise provided. But it does not seem that individual regiments were attached permanently. The connection was rather which exists in a modern army between foot and horse and guns. The normal army corps must have all three, but, save for convenience at mobilisation, there is no special tie between any particular battery and any particular squadrons of cavalry.

F. HAVERFIELD.

NOTES

THE ENCLITIC FORMS OF 'ΕΓΩ AND ΣΤ WITH SPECIAL REFERENCE TO JOHN XX. 17, AND ACTS XXVI. 28.

THE enclitic forms of ἐγὼ and σὺ are particularly common when the so-called ethical dative is involved. It is not necessary to multiply examples. Everyone knows such familiar instances as Demosth. 910.28 καὶ μοι ἀνάγνωθι τὴν μαρτυρίαν τῶν παραγενομένων, 918.29 καὶ μοι ἀνάγνωθι τούτων τὰς μαρτυρίας, where μοι may be represented by 'if

you please.' Perhaps, however, it has not always been observed that the enclitic, in such cases, comes early with surprising frequency, and is attached to such unimportant words as καί, ἀλλά, μή, and the like. For instance, Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 493 δὲν δὴ . . . δέδοικ' ἐγὼ—μή μοι βεβήκη, i.e. 'lest I may find him gone.'

But, unless I mistake, very few have observed that the dative is a mere accident of the particular construction: exactly the same effect is obtained by other cases of the enclitic. Take Plato,

Phaedo 117A, Ch. 66. ἕως ἂν σου βάρους ἐν τοῖς σκέλεσι γένηται, *i.e.* 'until you find your legs heavy.' Here σου performs the function of an ethical dative, but as the enclitic ultimately belongs to σκέλεσι it is put in the genitive case.

Exactly similar is μεν in Anacreon's lyric beginning μεσσυνηκτίους ποθ' ὦραις at ll. 8 and 9. 'Τίς, ἔφην, θύρας ἀράσσει—κατά μεν σχίσας ὀνείρους;' = 'breaking, if you please, into my dreams.'

A good example is John xx. 17, μὴ μου ἅπτου, where μου is practically μοι, but the dative becomes genitive under the influence of ἅπτου, and the sense is almost certainly: 'Nay, I prithee, cling no longer.'

Thus the two noticeable features are that (1) an enclitic form is usually employed with the 'ethical' dative or with the equivalent, in sense, of an 'ethical' dative; (2) the enclitic comes early in the sentence, and may be attached to words of no great importance, the enclitic belonging primarily to the whole sentence and only secondarily to some particular word.

Ignorance of these facts has, I fancy, produced the famous confusion of readings at Acts 26, 28. I believe the original reading to have been: ἐν ὀλίγῳ με πείθει χριστιανὸν ποιῆσαι. Here με is just like the μου of John xx. 17. It begins by being 'ethical,' *i.e.* = 'if you please, forsooth,' and it ends in being governed by ποιῆσαι. Thus, literally, the words may be translated: 'With small trouble, forsooth (με), you fancy that you have made me a Christian.'

The copyist of B and Aleph quite instinctively wrote πείθεις to govern με, and later scribes, as was inevitable, changed ποιῆσαι to γενέσθαι in order to make sense.

H. DARNLEY NAYLOR.

The University, Adelaide.

NOTE ON PLATO: PHAEDO, p. 105a.

ὄρα δὴ εἰ οὕτως ὀρίζη . . . ἐκείνο ὃ ἂν ἐπιφέρῃ τι ἐναντίον ἐκείνῳ, ἐφ' ὅτι ἂν αὐτὸ ἦ, μηδέποτε δέξασθαι.

It is with an anxiety approaching dismay that I, a layman as regards philosophy, find myself compelled to

differ from Professor Burnet in the interpretation of this vexed passage. But I make a practice of trying to unravel the difficulties of the classics for myself; and the process by which I attempt to arrive at an understanding, from which, at any rate, I have derived most assistance, is the simple process of weighing carefully the language that surrounds the passage in question. Professor Burnet, of course, has done that in the present passage: he has done a great deal more for the interpretation of it that I could not have done. But I cannot think that he has applied the linguistic test, if I may so call it, successfully.

At p. 104d, Socrates has said that things which, though not enemies to another thing, yet do not await its attack, but either perish or 'withdraw,' are those which compel 'that which they occupy' (*i.e.*, in the original illustration, Socrates, as 'occupied by' σμικρότης; in the more complicated, a number as 'occupied' by the Triad) to contain their (or perhaps, its own) form, and, invariably, something besides, that is enemy to another Thing. The occupied position is referred to as ὅτι in the words ὅτι ἂν κατάσχη. Presently he says that this other Form—we are not concerned here with the confusion between Things and Forms that seems, at least to me, to vitiate the whole of the argument with which the Phaedo closes—can never gain access to the position, ἐπὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον οὐδέποτε ἂν ἔλθοι (I presume he means, so long as the enemy is safely inside—but this point is not worked out). Passing over our passage for a moment, we finally discover that the 'position' occupied is the σῶμα, the occupying Thing is the ψυχή, and it 'comes to that position'—ἡκεῖ ἐπ' ἐκείνο ὅτι ἂν κατάσχη—bringing ζῶν.

Now in the words ἐφ' ὅτι ἂν αὐτὸ ἦ of our passage, I do not see how αὐτὸ can apply to anything but the Thing in occupation of the position. The attacking Thing, we have been told, οὐδέποτε ἂν ἔλθοι ἐπὶ τὸ τοιοῦτον (the position). When Professor Burnet tells us that ἐπιέναι is used invariably of that which attacks, he surely does not mean to include in this statement ἵέναι ἐπί. Else

how does he account for ἡκει ἐπ' ἐκείνο (= the position = σῶμα), said of the ψυχή? It is equally certain that ἐφ' ὅτι is the position occupied, the σῶμα. There is one really awkward point in the language. Is ἐκείνω antecedent of ἐφ' ὅτι? Two passages bear on this point: and the first of them inclines one to answer, with confidence, No; but the other equally strongly suggests the answer, Yes. I mean, of course (1) τὸ γὰρ ἐναντίον αἰεὶ αὐτῷ ἐπιφέρει, and (2) ψυχὴ αἰεὶ ἡκει ἐπ' ἐκείνο φέρουσα ζώην. Platonists, I suppose, would consider it wicked to say that Plato has fallen into a confusion here: but a non-Platonist might venture to say so, and to point out that ἐπιφέρειν τινί τι is an ambiguous expression. I presume that any Platonist who would follow me in the interpretation of ἐφ' ὅτι ἂν αὐτὸ ἦν would say that ἐφ' ὅτι stands for ἐπ' ἐκείνο ἐφ' ὅτι.

E. C. MARCHANT.

Lincoln College, Oxford.

ANONIS—ONONIS.

THE plant *Aresta bovis* (Anglice Cammock or Rest-harrow) is now called ἄνωνίδα, and the regular Latin form seems to be Anonis (the new Latin Thesaurus, which I do not possess, should be consulted for this). The MSS. of Dioscorides also seem to have ἄν. In the very pretty couplet (attributed, I think, by somebody to Philetas and certainly of that school)

ὥς ἂν' ἐχινόποδας¹ καὶ ἀνὰ τρηχέϊαν
ὄνωνιν

φύονται μαλακῶν ἄνθεα λευκοῖον

the best MSS. of Plutarch (who quotes it twice—44 e and 435 a), have at least in one passage ἄνωνιν, but others have ὄνωνιν. It seems to me obvious that the correct name of the plant is ἄνωνις, and that ὄνωνις is an ancient popular corruption similar to sparrow-grass for asparagus, etc. The corruption did not perpetuate itself in the

modern language, which discarded the word ὄνος for ass and substituted a nickname just as we have done. So the ἄν in ἄνωνις has survived after a temporary eclipse by the 'donkey' of popular etymology. I have little hesitation in restoring ἄνωνιν to the couplet at least, as the poet is not one who would have used such a vulgar corruption in what was evidently a passionate passage, and I think in future Greek lexika the word should be entered as ἄνωνις, thus conforming to the Latin.

W. R. PATON.

Vathy, Samos.

CORINNA.

MELEAGER in the Proem to his *Stephanus* (vv. 31-2) bestows especial praise on a poetess called Parthenis:

ἐν δὲ καὶ ἐκ λειμῶνος ἀμωμήτοιο σέλινα,
βασιὰ διακνίζων ἄνθεα, Παρθενίδος.

She is otherwise unknown, which is at least very remarkable. It would be less so, if he had simply contented himself with mentioning her name and the plant he assigned to her, as he does in most cases.

I suggest that Parthenis is Corinna (παρθένος = κόρη). He could, of course, have got Κόριννα into a verse, but the same applies to Asclepiades whom he calls by his nickname Sikelides. We must simply suppose that he could not get it in as he wished, and so substituted Parthenis.

There are no epigrams in our *Anthology* attributed to Corinna (as there are none attributed to Parthenis or to a few other poets cited in the Proem), but there were epigrams attributed to her (*Suidas* s.v. Κορίννα). If there were evidence that she wrote Παρθένια (as stated in Smith's *Biographical Dictionary*) my case would be strengthened, but this rests on the Scholion to Aristophanes *Ach.* 720, and however we correct this corrupt Scholion, the Parthenia of Pindar seem to be meant.

I only submit as containing a modicum of probability this conjecture about a poetess who has recently risen from the dead in Egypt. Meleager's

¹ I am familiar with this plant, still so called, but cannot give the scientific name. L and S does not identify it. The new edition should consult the living language more in such matters.

high compliment can scarcely be otherwise explained than by supposing that Parthenis was a lady still alive whom he knew.

W. R. PATON.

Vathy, Samos, Greece.

A NOTE ON SOPH. *O.T.* 980—2.

σὺ δ' εἰς τὸ μητρὸς μὴ φοβοῦ νυμφεύματα·
πολλοὶ γὰρ ἤδη κὰν ὀνείρασιν βροτῶν
μητρὶ ξυνευνάσθησαν.

Jebb has, I think, missed the point of this passage through not observing how small the difference is between dreams and realities to the popular mind, both among the Greeks and in other races. Thus in Pindar, *Ol.* XIII. 65 *sqq.*, Athena visits Bellerophon in a dream; yet the dream is so real that the vision leaves a solid and material bridle behind it. So Artemidoros, I. 35, teaches that it is a good omen for a man being tried on a capital charge to dream that he has lost his head; for the head can be lost only once, and if it be lost in a dream that ends the matter.

Jebb notes: 'κὰν ὀνείρασιν, in dreams also (as well as in this oracle); and as such dreams have proved vain, so may this oracle.' Such is indeed part of the argument which Oedipus and Iokaste use to dispell their fears; but not in this form, nor is this their only consolation. Jocasta is inclined to think all oracles false, because Apollo prophesied that

Laios' son would kill him, whereas the very reverse took place; but as Oedipus has still a lingering faith in them, she falls in with his humour and takes up his own attempt at explanation (*cf.* 969). 'Either,' she says in effect, 'oracles are cheats, or they are so equivocal that the most terrible ones may turn out to be quite harmless. Apollo said you would kill your father and wed your mother; the first part is true in a way, if Polybos died of grief at your absence; the second may equally be true without any guilt on your part. You have probably dreamed of such things, and superstitious folk would say that such a dream is as good as reality for some purposes.' The *καί* may be interpreted either (1) 'in dreams as well as in real life,' or (2) 'in a mere dream and not in reality, as *also* your killing of Polybos was no reality but a mere metaphor.'

NOTE.—I now see that Prof. Gilbert Murray takes substantially the same view of this passage. See his translation of the play (London, 1911), p. 56:

Prophets deem

A deed wrought that is wrought but in a dream.

I am glad to have the support of a scholar of such acknowledged taste and acuteness for what I had fancied to be simply a guess of my own.

H. J. ROSE.

McGill University, Montreal.

REVIEWS

THE COMPOSITION OF THE ILIAD.

The Composition of the Iliad: an Essay on a numerical law in its structure, by AUSTIN SMYTH, M.A., late Fellow of Trinity College, Cambridge, Librarian of the House of Commons. Longmans. 6s. net. 1914.

THE criticism of Homer is passing from the primary sources, that is to say, the Germans who invent our mistakes, and from the vulgarisateurs who import and vend them, to the hands of scholars

and amateurs. This has long been the case with theology, where the learned parson and the speculative layman steadily augment the literature. Two books of this kind have lately appeared on Homer. One, on the *Odyssey*, by Mr. Thomson, I am to have the honour of noticing elsewhere. Mr. Austin Smyth, who is the Librarian of the House of Commons, a position in which much is excusable, has written a book on the *Composition of the Iliad* which he

defines by his sub-title as an 'Essay on a numerical law in its structure,' and whose object is he says in his preface 'to demonstrate that the *Iliad* of Homer at one time consisted of 13,500 lines, neither more nor less, divided into 45 sections of 300 verses each, with major divisions after the 15th and 30th of these; from which it follows that the remaining 2,193 verses, which appear in our present texts, are more recent additions, and ought to be removed.' An appendix contains a similar proposition with regard to the *Odyssey*. Mr. Smyth appears to be serious in what he advances, and to believe that he has proved it. He has begot however a well-known type of essay. There are no numerical laws; an antistrophe corresponds more or less to a strophe; but strophe, ode, paean and play are of unlimited length, and Mnemosyne does not prompt me with an ancient sonnet. It is none the less a tendency in our minds to discover these non-existent laws. The history of philology is strewn with these weaknesses of noble minds. Decency forbids most of them to be mentioned; but Mr. Smyth—who does not cite much literature—may like to know that Drerup has lately discovered a unit of 1,000 verses, from which it follows that the *Iliad* is a plexus of fifteen 1,000's. Mr. Smyth's unit (300) is arrived at from a consideration of the needs of recitation. So was Drerup's. Drerup tells us he experimented. He was more generous to the rhapsode anyway. Are we to suppose, with Mr. Smyth, the rhapsode, like a Hobbs or a Mr. Spooner, counting his centuries, and playing more freely after the 250 had gone up? I cannot see the faintest likelihood of such a unit, and Mr. Smyth

has made no attempt to make it probable. If he had considered the circumstances of the Panathenaea, or of the country festivals, how many lines the daylight and the patience of the audience allowed each of so many rhapsodes; or endeavoured to establish the compass of the old divisions of Homer as quoted by ancient authors, I do not say he would have arrived at any conclusion, but he would have been on the right tack. I cannot conceive that any theatre full of eager paupers collected for a yearly event would have been satisfied with 300 lines from a single rhapsode; and if not, where is the unit?

The results, that is to say, the elimination of 2,193 lines, which Mr. Smyth obtains by applying his canon, I do not think it necessary to go through, for we all know that when we have a hypothesis we can adapt any material to it, much more so a honeycombed document like the *Iliad*. I hope Dr. Leaf, to whom he makes a general confession in his preface, will forgive him for dealing so lightly with the Trojan Catalogue, that more than primordial fossil.

I have called Mr. Smyth an amateur, and I have expressed a belief in his seriousness. I am not entirely persuaded on the latter point; he seems to me to be too easy in face of the uncertainty which besets us on every side in Homer. He has a taste for literature, and I am far from saying that he has not improved Homer. However, it is so difficult nowadays to satisfy both the truth and an author, that if I receive two of Mr. Smyth's friends or his lawyer, I will withdraw my statements and leave his agreeable book to the public.

T. W. ALLEN.

THE AUTHORSHIP OF THE PLATONIC EPISTLES.

The Authorship of the Platonic Epistles.
By R. HACKFORTH, M.A. 8vo. 1 vol.
Pp. 203. Manchester: University
Press, 1913.

ALTHOUGH many foreign scholars, since the days of Ast nearly a century ago, have written at length both for and

against the genuineness of the so-called *Epistles of Plato*, our English Platonists and historians of Classical literature have conspired to ignore the question. It would be hard to point to anything in English which attempts to handle the matter seriously, with the exception of some pages in Grote's *History* and in

Mr. Richards' *Platonica*. Hence the very careful and thoroughgoing examination of the whole subject which Mr. Hackforth offers in the volume before us fills a real gap, and deserves, if only on that account, a grateful welcome from all students of Classics. The most important of the more modern criticisms of the *Epistles* are those by Raeder, Ritter and R. Adam; and the present work is largely based on these, especially in regard to linguistic statistics. Mr. Hackforth's method is to deal with the *Epistles* one by one, giving a summary of the contents of each, and then passing on to consider critical questions as to linguistic affinities, date, objections to authenticity, etc. At the end of his opening chapter ('General Introduction,' p. 34) he thus states his conclusions: 'iii., vii. and viii. I believe to be Platonic beyond all reasonable doubt: iv. and xiii. show evidence of authenticity only next to these: ix., x. and xi. must be left doubtful, chiefly because of their brevity: while i., ii., v., vi., xii. are unquestionably spurious.' By far the most interesting of the letters is, of course, the seventh, and those who regard it as genuine will be glad to find Mr. Hackforth supporting their view; but I, for one, doubt whether I could ever persuade myself to father on Plato what I must still regard—*pace* Mr. Hackforth—as an intolerable *mischmasch*. And I should refuse to be bullied into changing my mind by such epithets as 'subjective' and 'sentimental.' None

the less, what Mr. Hackforth writes in explanation and defence of the 'philosophical digression'—as well as the other digressions—in *Ep.* vii., and his ingenious imaginations as to the state of mind of Dion's party in 353-2 B.C., deserve careful consideration and may even carry conviction to less prejudiced minds.

In dealing with *Ep.* vi. Mr. Hackforth makes the plausible suggestion that the writer is borrowing from the *Symposium*, and he tries to identify the two gods—Father and Son—with the *αὐτὸ τὸ καλόν* and Eros of that dialogue. The former identification is highly improbable, and ascribes to the writer 'a confused memory of the *Symposium*' of a quite preposterous kind. Raeder's identification of the two gods with the World-soul and the Demiurgus is much more probable, and there may be an echo of the *βασιλικὸς νοῦς* and the *αἴτιον* of *Phileb.* 30 D. E., especially as the *σπουδῇ-παιδιά* antithesis is also found in that context. In the course of his discussion Mr. Hackforth makes several interesting contributions to the textual criticism of the *Epistles*—amongst others, the plausible conjecture *ἐφ' ὧν μούνας* for *ἐπομύνοντας* in the passage in *Ep.* vi. (323 D.) alluded to above. Useful collections of linguistic parallels, and a chronological table, are supplied in three Appendixes. It is a pity that the printing of the Greek is defaced by so many instances of faulty accentuation.

R. G. B.

DIE ENTSTEHUNG DER AENEIS.

Die Entstehung der Aeneis. Von ALFRED GERCKE. Pp. 205. Berlin: Wiedmannsche Buchhandlung, 1913. M. 6.

PROFESSOR GERCKE has undertaken a careful and exhaustive examination of the *Aeneid* from the point of view of the analytical rather than the aesthetic critic. His results are reached almost entirely by a consideration of internal evidence; but in c. iv. entitled 'The External Evidence,' he makes exceed-

ingly skilful use of the scanty testimony we possess to support the conclusions to which his analysis has led him. This, as he himself admits, is a reversal of the usual order of procedure. But he maintains consistently the supreme value of analysis, and takes to task the 'Aesthetic' critics (more especially his immediate predecessor, Richard Heinze), for their sentimental and 'anti-vivisection' attitude. 'The critical knife must be wielded by the hand of the linguistic (philologisch) inter-

preter firmly and sternly without respect for sentiment' (p. 7). Professor Gercke has certainly been true to his own principles.

It is difficult to know where to begin in discussing a book which contains so many assertions on points of detail resting upon closely linked and interlocking chains of argument. Into detailed exposition or refutation this is not the place to enter; nor when examining a work on the strength of internal evidence is it possible to generalise broadly as to what is true or false. Everything must be taken in its context, and the appeal must necessarily lie to the judgment of the individual reader. But a summary of the main conclusions may possibly suggest a few remarks as to the methods employed.

The central point of Professor Gercke's thesis, as expounded in cc. iii. and iv., is that the last six books of the *Aeneid* ('the Roman Iliad') bear clear signs of having been composed earlier than the first six books ('the Roman Odyssey') but that we can trace an extensive 'Umarbeitung' of the later books to suit the poet's more mature conception of the story. Here he makes full use of the evidence of Suetonius in Donatus' life (§§ 30, 31) and Propertius (II. 34. 61-6) on the question of date. With regard to the latter passage (written, as is universally admitted, soon after Gallus' death in 26 B.C.), he points out, following Rothstein, that, though in *Lavinia litora* we have a verbal reminiscence of *Aen.* I. 2 (a prelude which stands apart from the body of the work), no reference at all is made to the wanderings of the first six books, but only to the battle of Actium, described in *Aen.* VIII. 675-713, to the wars of Trojan Aeneas, and the foundation of Lavinium, which is not included at all in the existing epic. It is a case where an *argumentum ex silentio* seems to be justified; for an admirer wishing to pick typical scenes from a more or less complete *Aeneid* could hardly have avoided all reference to Books I.-VI. The inference is that Books I.-VI. were not yet put into shape, but that Propertius has seen or heard something of the contents of Books VII.-XII.

This receives substantial confirmation when we consider the information in Donatus' life as to the gradual growth of the idea of a poem in Virgil's mind 'in quo, quod maxime studebat, Romanae simul urbis et Augusti origo contineretur,' and couple this with the evidence of *Georgics* III. 46-48 ('Mox tamen ardentis accingar dicere pugnas Caesaris') and Prop. II. 1. 42 ('Caesaris in Phrygiis condere nomen avos,' etc.), we are surely justified in concluding that the form in which the *Aeneid* first took shape in Virgil's mind was that of a great historical poem, somewhat on the lines of Ennius, which began with the landing of Aeneas in Latium, and culminated in the triumphs of Caesar Augustus. But 'the old legendary history soon threw its chains about him and gradually took the shape of an independent epic. Even then he may still have thought of composing a complete epic cycle; but at the time when Propertius' elegy was written he had postponed, if not wholly given up, the idea of carrying the historical epic down to his own time and celebrating Augustus' victories' (p. 76). Still, that would explain the fact that the wars of Aeneas were already taking shape by 26 B.C., even though when Augustus wrote to Virgil about the same date (on the expedition against the Cantabri, 27-25 B.C.) to know 'how Aeneas was getting on,' Virgil answered, 'tanta inchoata res est, ut paene vitio mentis tantum opus ingressus mihi videar' (Macr. I. 24. 11). This is just the language of a man who is in the first stages of thinking out a great composition: and there is no doubt that Virgil's increasing devotion to philosophy, which he mentions in the same letter, had led him to reconsider his subject and choose as his new theme the character and destiny of a single man actuated by devotion to a divine purpose.

With this part of Professor Gercke's argument I find myself in complete agreement. For if we accept his account of the modification of Virgil's intentions, it is perfectly easy to understand why the subject-matter of Books VII.-XII. engaged his attention first, and not, as

a priori we might have expected, that of Books II., IV., and VI.; though it is quite probable that these were the first to be really finished (*cf.* Suetonius' phrase 'perfecta demum materia' in reference to the recitation of these books to Augustus in 23 B.C.).

In his treatment of the relation of the different books in detail to each other I feel that the writer is less convincing. As is inevitable, he devotes a good deal of attention to discussing the date of Book III., and finally decided it is 'jung und doch alt'—*i.e.* that it was written after the main portion of Books VII.-XII., but before Books I., II., IV., and VI. Here he stands midway between Nettleship and Heinze, the former of whom thinks it 'one of the earliest books which Virgil completed' (*Essay on Virgil's Life and Times*, p. 66), while the latter, on grounds which seem to me absolutely convincing, decides that it was added after at least two-thirds of the work was composed (*Virgil's Epische Technik*, p. 93). The unique characteristic of Book III. is, of course, the *gradual* revelation of Aeneas' destiny; this, according to Professor Gercke, is the earliest conception of the story; in Books VII.-XII., as originally drafted, and in Book III., Aeneas did not know what his 'fata' were. In Books I.-II., parts of IV., V., and VI. he is clearly conscious of his destiny; and this is a later development influenced by Stoicism. But the arguments for the priority of Book III. to Book II. (p. 32) seem to me very weak indeed, and involve the arbitrary separation of III. 500-505 from the rest of Aeneas' farewell to Helenus as a 'later addition,' for which there is not the slightest justification. This, indeed, is one of the dangers of the author's method; for he constantly has recourse to suppression of inconvenient passages and reconstruction of what Virgil 'must have originally written' in order to suit his own theories.

One of the most tantalising chapters is c. vi., in which he discusses the gradual development of the idea of the Stoic εἰμαρμένη in Virgil's mind as the poem grew. Here the arguments are

marshalled with great ingenuity; but the actual relation of Fate to Free-will, whether of gods or men, in Virgil's philosophy, is never fully considered. On the other hand, the exposition of the way in which the Νέκυια in Book VI. first took shape as a conjuration of the dead (Totenbeschwörung), on the model of the *Odyssey*, and only afterwards became a *κατάβασις*, is both acute and convincing (pp. 187-197); and on several other points, *e.g.* the character of Latinus, and the place taken by Apollo in the scheme of the *Aeneid*, there is much that deserves consideration in the views put forward.

To conclude, the book has the defects of its qualities. It is an interesting experiment conducted with great patience and considerable ingenuity, and one quite worth the making. But in view of the highly speculative nature of its arguments, and the lack of positive evidence, except where other authorities help us, we can hardly admit it to be more. If we remember the way in which Virgil went to work at the *Aeneid*, 'prout liberet quidque et nihil in ordinem arripiens,' with 'tibicines' to prop the incomplete parts of the edifice, we necessarily feel that all analysis in detail of the stages of composition must be largely in the nature of guesswork, depending in the last resort on subjective impressions and individual standards. Exactly how much consistency in detail we have a right to demand from the author of a great epic is a question that will never be agreed upon; but upon the whole it would appear from the book before us that the only sure advance in Virgilian criticism must lie along 'aesthetic' rather than 'analytical' lines; in other words, it must insist rather on starting from the essential unity of design in the *Aeneid* than on emphasising inconsistencies of detail which, however alluring the clues they provide to those determined to explore the labyrinth of a poet's workshop, do little to impair the breadth and singleness of the whole masterpiece.

L. W. HUNTER.

New College, Oxford.

TWO EDITIONS OF LUCAN.

M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis Libros Decem tertium edidit CAROLUS HOSIUS. 8vo. Pp. lviii+395. Lipsiae: Teubner, MCMXIII. M. 4.40.

THE Teubner text of Lucan has fittingly celebrated its majority by appearing in a third edition. It is hardly possible to overestimate the debt which the textual criticism of the poet owes to the self-sacrificing labours of Dr. Hosius. If a few details in the edition still seem open to criticism, they are of slight importance when contrasted with the solid merits of the work as a whole. One can only hope that the ominous words of the Preface—‘cum iam in eo sit, ut ex campo in umbram secedam’—do not preclude all prospect of further contributions from the learned editor to the subject which he has made his own.

The second edition was noticed at considerable length in these columns (October, 1906). The chief novelty in the latest edition consists in the grammatical and metrical indices, which contain some very useful statistics compiled with true German thoroughness. No student of the Latin hexameter can afford to neglect Index III. Index II. opens with ‘orthographica quaedam,’ from which we see that the best MSS. strongly support the spellings *uolgus*, *uolnus*, *uolsus*, etc.; and indeed it is not unlikely that Lucan and many other poets of the Empire preferred to retain these older spellings. *Neclego*, a spelling which is slowly gaining recognition, is well attested by the best codices, and Hosius has rightly adopted it in his text.

After the orthographical notes we find some interesting details as to the gender of nouns, ‘poetical’ and other singulars and plurals, and heteroclitics, then very full information about the declension of nouns and adjectives and about the remaining parts of speech. The chief impression conveyed by these lists is, as we should expect, that metrical convenience largely determined the choice of word-forms. We are not surprised to find it stated, for instance,

that *Libye* is the only form of the nominative found in Lucan, or that he uses the forms *Brundisii*, *Dyrrachii*, *coniugii*, and on the other hand *Corfini*, *Domiti*, *Hortensi*. But such lists are by no means useless. It is helpful to know that Lucan avails himself of the form *Libye* when the nominative is wholly excluded, for example, by Vergil and Valerius Flaccus, and it is useful to learn that he avoids single *-i* in the genitive of *-io*-stems except in a few proper names. Indeed Hosius’ index is far from being limited to self-evident facts. On p. 376 we are reminded of the extraordinary *natrrix uiolator* (IX. 720), and it is pointed out that Lucan treats *dies* and *serpens* indifferently as masculine or feminine. On the next page we find that he wrote *fastibus* = *fastis*, and that there is good MSS. authority for *fastus* = *fastos*. Turning over a few pages we find it recorded that the pronoun *is* occurs only once in the nominative (also *eum* and *eam* each once), that *tanti* (and even *tantus* once) is used of number, that *adsentio* is employed instead of the deponent form, that *iaculatus* is found in a passive sense, and that we meet with *absorpsi* as Perf. of *absorbeo*. These are only a few instances taken almost at random.

Some small criticisms may perhaps be offered on this part of the book. It seems unnecessary, if not misleading, to record, in an *Index Grammaticus*, forms which are merely the vagaries of certain MSS., such as *lampadis*, Nom. Plur., *furoris*, Acc. Plur. The space saved by the omission of these might have been occupied by a few brief parenthetical notes which a scholar with Hosius’ knowledge could have written without trouble, e.g., p. 379, ‘*noton* (non nisi apud L., ut uidetur),’ p. 382, ‘*fuscator* (ἀπ. εἰρ.).’ On p. 377, col. 1, ‘*verber*’ is misleading; of course only the Gen. and Abl. of the singular are used by Lucan, and the word ought rather to have been classed with the *defectiva* on the next page. P. 379, col. 1, *Ariminon* (I. 231), though only a conjecture, is very possibly right, and was worth mentioning. Ib., col. 2,

Aegypti (X. 159) surely cannot be Nom. Plur. Pp. 382 sq. The section on adjectives might well have included a list of characteristic compounds, some of which seem to be found only in Lucan (*fatilegus* IX. 821, *hareninuagus* IX. 941, *irredux* IX. 408, *taurifer* I. 473). P. 383, col. 1, *hic = meus*. Add VII. 117. Ib. *quis = uter*. Add VII. 281. P. 383, col. 2, '*triumphatus* II. 90, (*auditus* IV. 716 VIII. 361).' This is not clearly expressed; the meaning is that in the two passages quoted *auditus* = 'heard of,' not 'heard.' P. 386, col. 1, *qualiter*. Add I. 100. P. 387, col. 1. Add *nec non* V. 703, VII. 161, IX. 1062, X. 133, 258, 519; *nec non et* VII. 56, X. 486.

In the present edition the *Praefatio* is revised and enlarged and the *apparatus criticus* is altered in many places, chiefly through a fresh examination of M by the editor himself, and by means of Bick's new collation of the Vienna palimpsest and Endt's edition of the *Adnotationes*. The record of the readings of Z has undergone some changes. On comparing it with my own collation for several hundred lines of Book II. and Book IV., I have found in the latter case that we agree almost entirely, but in Book II. there are still some discrepancies which, though not, perhaps, of great importance, tempt one to wish for an opportunity of re-examining the codex. Account has been taken of suggestions on the text issued since the publication of the second edition (1905), but as the editor has refrained from increasing the bulk of the *apparatus*, some interesting conjectures have remained unnoticed, e.g. *pater* for *sacer* in IV. 191 (Garrod in *C.Q.* V., p. 214), *sinu* for *manu* in VIII. 770 (Postgate). Into the text itself very few changes have been introduced; the only one of importance which I have noticed is *Lingonas* (I. 398), which is certainly right. One would gladly have seen more changes. A scholar so sound as Hosius must be aware that several of the readings in his text cannot be what Lucan wrote. In such cases, if no conjecture is convincing enough to be adopted, we might have expected to find some indication of the state of matters, either in the text or (preferably)

in the apparatus. It seems quite impossible to defend the traditional reading in I. 688, *nunc desuper Alpīs | nubiferae colles atque aeriam Pyrenen | abripimur*, or in VII. 735, *fessis aut Marte subactis* (of Caesar's soldiers after a victory), yet in these and in not a few other instances Hosius gives no hint that he considers the traditional text unsound. Thus the casual observer might be led to suppose that the greatest living authority on Lucan believes that his poet was capable of writing impossible Latin or sheer nonsense.

The editor still shows the scholarly caution which we admired in his previous recensions, and he still regards M and Z as presenting the best tradition. When he adopts a reading which is comparatively ill-supported (e.g. at II. 426, IV. 20, ib. 86), one cannot but feel that he does so with good reason—indeed, a little more boldness in this direction might have been welcome. The combination V P G Q might well have induced even a cautious editor to write *sint* in VIII. 645 (*nescis, crudelis, ubi ipsa | viscera sint Magni*); *sunt* cannot really be proved correct by I. 126 and IX. 563, and Hosius here, as in some other places (e.g. I. 648, VII. 317, and probably IV. 719, to take the first instances that occur to me), seems to pamper M and Z unduly. It is rather surprising to find *voluit* still read instead of *voluit* in VII. 658, in spite of Cortius, Dr. Postgate, and the scholiast. In the matter of punctuation, an excessive conservatism seems to have led our editor astray, but occasionally he errs even when some of his predecessors have been correct. If he has not seen Mr. J. D. Duff's article (*Journ. of Phil.*, vol. xxxii., pp. 127, 133), in which the true punctuation of VIII. 118 sq. and 549 sq. is pointed out, he could have found the first passage correctly punctuated in the editions of Schrevelius and Oudendorp, and the second in the edition of Stephanus (1545). Other instances of misleading punctuation occur at I. 9 (where the preceding *quis* shows that we ought to read *cruorem*?), IV. 508 (read *vita*?), VII. 475 (read *manus*?), VIII. 319 (read *ortu*). This list could easily be increased.

I have noticed only one typographical

error, '640' for '460' in the *apparatus criticus*, p. 209.

W. B. ANDERSON.

Manchester University.

M. Annaei Lucani de Bello Civili.
Liber VII. Edited by J. P. POSTGATE,
Litt.D., F.B.A. 8vo. Pp. xxxviii
+ 98. Cambridge: at the University
Press, 1913. 2s.

IN 1896 Dr. Postgate earned the gratitude of all students of Lucan by his admirable edition of Book VII. A new edition has now been issued, in which some corrections and several improvements have been made in the commentary, a supplementary note has been appended to the Introduction, and the Critical Appendix has been considerably shortened. The last-mentioned change will cause some regret among those who have used the first edition. Dr. Postgate's textual notes are always illuminating and never dull, and we should have been glad to see them increased both in size and in number. Indeed, the only real fault to be found in the edition as a whole is its brevity. When we read, for example (n. on v. 110), that 'the plup. is often used in Latin for clearness or other reasons instead of the aor.,' we may be pardoned for wishing that a grammarian so accomplished as the editor had given more freely of the fruits of his observation. But doubtless the plan of the edition seemed to preclude such fulness of comment, and it must be gratefully acknowledged that within his self-imposed limits Dr. Postgate has packed a wonderful amount of explanation and illustration. The fact that we feel inclined to 'ask for more' is sufficient proof of our appreciation of the fare set before us.

The changes in the text are few; the most notable is the restoration of the MSS. reading, *erigitur*, in v. 141, instead of the editor's tempting *corrigitur*. The traditional reading is now convincingly supported by means of similar passages in Statius. Francken's *sen* is adopted in v. 459 in place of *si*, and it certainly seems an improvement.

One would like to quote some of the many good things to be found in the

commentary, but in the case of a work which has been before the public for eighteen years we may assume that its qualities are well known and duly appreciated. It will suffice, therefore, to make a few remarks which might perhaps be considered when the next edition is in preparation.

v. 25, delete comma after '72 n.'
vv. 28-32 (Commentary and Addenda):

'unde pares somnos populis noctemque beatam?
o felix, si te uel sic tua Roma uideret!
donassent utinam superi patriaeque tibi que 30
unum, Magne, diem, quo fati certus uterque
extremum tanti fructum raperetis amoris.'

This piece of strained rhetoric does not seem to be completely explained, but the editor's (and Professor Housman's) interpretation of *populis* (v. 28) as 'the peoples of Italy' is certainly necessary to a right understanding of the passage. I venture to think that if we note the following points the meaning and the connexion will become clear. (1) *Somnos* in v. 28 is a deliberate echo of *somnos* in v. 24 (*ne rumpite somnos, | castrorum uigiles*): 'disturb not Pompey's slumbers: would that the peoples of Italy might enjoy such slumbers as his (*pares somnos*) with such happy illusions of the night (*noctem beatam*). (2) *uel sic* = *uel per pares somnos noctemque beatam*, even in a mere dream, like Pompey's, of a happiness now past and gone. (3) *noctem* (v. 28) is contrasted with *diem* (v. 31), and *fati certus* is emphatic: better than such a happy vision of the night would it have been if Rome and Pompey had been granted one day in which, with their destiny staring them in the face (not hidden by the glamour of a dream), they might taste for the last time the blessedness of their love. I suppose that *O felix, si* means 'O happy thou if . . .', but the sense would be somewhat improved if we could take *felix* with *tua Roma*, and this does not seem impossible when we consider how fond Lucan is of postponing the subject of a sentence.

v. 44. It might have been mentioned that *non* modifies the whole sentence, and is not to be taken with *pleno*; cf. I. 339, 455. 77. Livy (also Verg.) uses *uellere* in this sense. 117 *hoc*. Cf. v. 305. 127. Cf. V. 586. 135. Cf. I. 72-80. 145 (quotation from Stat.). For *haud*

read *non*. 162. -i in Abl. of comparatives is well attested in Livy. See also Hosius,³ p. 381. 214. 'The Act. *radio* is a myth.' There is, however, considerable authority for it in Flor. II. 13. 30 (IV. 2). 307. Cf. I. 325 sq. 308. Add V. 771; cf. II. 287 and Stat. *passim*. 320. A further n. on *non* with Jussive Subj. in post-Aug. Latin would have been welcome. 322. *Turbate* surely almost = *confundite* (v. 575); *uultus*, especially with *uerendos*, is not quite = *facies*. By viciously striking at the faces they are to obliterate the reverend look that might otherwise 'give them pause.' *Turb.* gives the sense of violently mixing up. Some familiar slang expressions (one of which has become almost classic) inevitably suggest themselves as equivalent to Lucan's brutal words, but in translating we shall have to be content with 'shatter their reverend looks,' or something similar.

340 and 510. Not mentioned in the Crit. App., to which the nn. refer the reader. 365. Is not *in medium* to be taken with *collectum*, *superf. com.* being Dative with *dabimus*? 373. The first part of the passage quoted from Sil. is suggested by Luc. I. 188. 392. Read *Inui* for *Inuri*. 395 *coacta*. Add IV. 798. 406. Would it not be better to read *nec* in the passage quoted from Ovid? This use of *ne* without a word such as *sic*, *eo*, *hactenus* preceding seems open to question. 436. It seems more natural and effective to take *incognita* as agreeing with *Roma* and used 'in the predicate' with *seruisses*. 477. A fuller n. desirable. See Obermeier, *Sprachegebrauch des M. A. Lucanus*, p. 35. 518 *coactum*. Is the expression really so strange? It can be paralleled in English as well as in Latin. 493. *umbonibus* prob. 'shields' in this passage. 497 *per . . . per*. Cf. III. 24, VI. 639, 734. 510. Imitation in Val. Flacc. 6. 31 might have been mentioned. 519. Cf. Claud. Stil. I. 258. 537. Add VI. Cons. Hon. 209. 568 (quotation from Sil. It.). For 439 read 441. 617. For 27 read 78. 740 *cunctis*. Surely Dat. 777 *Scythica ara*. Cf. I. 446, III. 86. 779 *humator*. Perhaps it was worth noting that this is *ἄν εἰρ.*; similarly *fuscator*, IV. 66. Lucan is very fond of words in -tor, several of which

are hardly found elsewhere. See Fick, *Krit. u. sprachliche Untersuchungen zu Lukian*, pp. 47 sqq.

A few notes on the Critical Appendix may be added.

v. 2. For 'Burmman' read 'Burman.' 180. The expression *mentibus unum | hoc solamen erat* is surely so natural that the poet might have written it without any thought of a contrast between *mentibus* and the *oculos* of the previous sentence. It seems, therefore, rather doubtful if we ought to resort to emendation. 421 '*omnibus armis*'; so Hosius.' But Hosius now (edd. 2 and 3) reads *annis*. 452. For *intulit* read *impulit*. 460-1 (see Hosius' *apparatus criticus*). A well-known crux, about which every student of Lucan has a theory. Dr. Postgate professes merely to give 'what Lucan may have written.' The problem is too large and thorny to be discussed within the limits of a short review. Perhaps I may give my opinion very briefly, hoping for some future opportunity of either supporting or retracting it. Like Dr. Postgate, I would follow those MSS. (including the ancient palimpsest), which put v. 463 before v. 462, but I think that *tempus* probably came from a mis-quotation by Lactantius. The following seems a possible reading:

'quo sua pila cadant, aut qua sibi fata minentur
inde manus, spectant; uultus cognoscere possunt,
facturi quae monstra forent: uidere parentes,'
etc.

i.e. they reconnoitre the enemy's position in order to see where they themselves and their foes are most open to attack. To their surprise they can recognise the faces of their opponents, and thus they realise what outrages they are on the eve of committing, for they see their fathers and brothers. For *uultus cognoscere* cf. V. 20. The change of *cognoscere* to *quo noscere* can easily be illustrated from the MSS. of Lucan. In IV. 168-172 there is a similar passage, which seems to lend considerable support to the view here propounded, especially in the case of a poet so prone to repeat himself as Lucan is. Since making the above emendation I have found that Leo has proposed *cognoscere* (see Samse, *Interpretationes Lucanae*, pp. 20 sq.), though he gives it a very

different context. 735. Possibly *iam Marte peracto* (cf. 249, Val. Flacc. 6. 436), *subactis* having crept in from v. 613. 748. Burman's *galeas* ought perhaps to have been mentioned. 765. *miseris*, with the punctuation proposed, is rather more effective, but it does not follow

that Lucan wrote it. There are some reasons for retaining *miseri*; see Haslauer's pamphlet, *Zu Lucans Pharsalia, Liber VII.*, pp. 42-44.

W. B. ANDERSON.

Manchester University.

A STUDY OF AUGUSTINE'S VERSIONS OF GENESIS.

A Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis. By JOHN S. MCINTOSH. Published by the Cambridge Press as Agents for the University of Chicago Press. 1912. 3s.

THIS is a careful piece of work in a corner of a wide field. The importance of the Old Latin Versions of the Bible lies in their antiquity, their witness to the contemporary Greek text, and their influence in moulding the thought and language of the Western Church. Thus we know from St. Cyprian's habitual use of it that a Latin translation of the Scriptures was current in Africa by A.D. 250; and, on account of the extreme fidelity with which the O.L. follows the LXX., it serves as evidence for a condition of the text earlier than that of the oldest Greek MSS. Fragments of this venerable translation exist in MSS. at Lyons, Würzburg, Munich, and the Vatican, dating from the sixth to the eighth centuries; otherwise it is chiefly known from abundant quotations in the early Fathers. The texts at our disposal raise many problems which have not yet been solved. What, for example, was the native home of the Version? It used to be called the *Vetus Itala*, but that designation begs too many questions to be allowed to stand. The earliest traces of a Latin Bible are found in North Africa; but this may only be due to the fact that the Latin literature of the second and third centuries is almost entirely African; and, owing to the close intercourse between Rome and Carthage at that period, there is no difficulty in supposing that the Version was brought over from Italy. Recent investigation, however, inclines our best authorities to look in the direction of Syria or Asia Minor for its birthplace, on account of

its intimate relations with the so-called 'Western' text of the N.T. and with the Syriac Versions. But have we the right to speak of a Version at all? Does not the evidence rather imply a number of independent translations? Or should we rather describe them as different recensions of a common archetype? The remarkable thing about the passages quoted by the Fathers is the number of variants in the text. Perhaps St. Augustine's allusion to the '*infinita varietas Latinorum interpretum*' ought not to be applied to this state of affairs, but an instance from St. Augustine himself will make it clear. He quotes the famous passage 'till Shiloh come' (Gen. xlix. 10) under three forms: (1) *donec veniant quae reposita sunt ei*, (2) *donec veniat cui repromissum est* (so Cyprian), (3) *donec veniat cui repositum est* (the most usual form in the Fathers). These differences, it is to be noticed, are not due to carelessness or lapse of memory, for they reflect corresponding variations in the LXX.; of which the standard text reads *ἕως ἂν ἔλθῃ τὰ ἀποκείμενα αὐτῷ*, with the variants, given by different groups of cursives, *ὃ ἀπόκειται αὐτῷ*, *ὃ ἀπόκειται*, *ὃ ἀπόκειται*. This illustration shows how complicated the problem is; it may also suggest the kind of answer which should be given to the questions raised above.

With much pains Mr. McIntosh has collected all St. Augustine's quotations from Genesis, amounting to 551 verses or parts of verses, and printed them consecutively, with valuable notes. Then, in order to determine whether St. Augustine used more than one version, he has analysed the various readings under such headings as the use of synonyms, a different form of construction, a different underlying Greek

text, a change in order, and the addition or omission of words. As a result of his enquiry he comes to the conclusion that the evidence points to several recensions of an original text rather than to independent translations. For due weight must be given to agreements as well as to differences; many verses of Gen. i.-iii., for example, in *De Genesi contra Manichaeos* agree verbatim with those quoted in *De Genesi ad litteram*; and throughout all the quotations exact correspondences in words and phrases occur in the midst of a large element of variation. Moreover, since the same phenomena appear in the quotations of Tertullian and St. Cyprian, it would seem that they too made use of codices which go back to the same original translation as the recensions which St. Augustine handled. The case is similar with the Lyons MS. (No. 54), which has many points in common with St. Augustine's citations. Thus Mr. McIntosh confirms the judgment expressed by Dr. H. A. A. Kennedy in his important article on the Latin Versions in Hasting's *Dictionary of the Bible*, vol. iii., p. 49a: 'One is bound to admit, at least, the increasing probability of the conclusion that at the basis of all the types of text there is one original version, which has determined, in great measure, the character of all the subsequent revisions.'

Mr. McIntosh devotes his last chapter to an examination of the language of the Old Latin Bible—a subject of great interest. Two noteworthy features come out. The first is the presence of a large number of forms characteristic of the *sermo plebeius*; e.g. substantives with terminations like *abominatio*, *divisio*, *incolatus*, *procreatura*, *nutritor*, *reliquarium* (i.e. remnant); adjectives, such as *fumabundus*, *cognoscibilis*, *pelliceus*; denominative verbs, such as *adaquare*, *appropriare* (= Vulg. *appropinquare*), *principari*; and the frequent use of compounds which have sunk to the level of simple verbs. A long list of rare words and departures from classical usage has been compiled. With regard to syntax, we are inclined to go further than Mr. McIntosh in recognising the influence of the LXX. and, through the LXX., of Hebrew idiom. Thus we cannot agree that *Fulvi oculi eius a vino*

et dentes candidiores lacte (Gen. xlix. 12) 'admits of two interpretations'; *a vino* is not an ablative of cause, but a reproduction of the Gk. *ὑπὲρ οἶνον*, which again is an attempt to express the Hebrew comparative. Equally Hebraic is the barbarism *non potest ad eum* (Gen. xxxii. 25), mediated through the Greek. And the same explanation must be given of the frequent expressions of the type, *Sem filius centum annorum cum genuit* etc. This is a familiar Hebraism; and we doubt whether in its Latin or Greek form it had its origin in colloquial use; the illustration from a Latin epitaph, *septem me natalis annorum gremio ipse recepit* (C.I.L. i. 1011)—an idiom fairly common in the inscriptions (Olcott, *Thes. Ling. Lat. Epigr.* i., p. 334)—is not strictly parallel nor sufficient to prove the point.

The other striking feature of the Latinity of these texts is its close imitation of the Greek of the LXX., which is deeply dyed with Semitisms. Mr. McIntosh illustrates this continually, but he does not always bring out clearly enough the ultimate source of the characteristics which he marks for notice. With his conclusion we quite agree. The Latinity of the Old Latin Bible exhibits some colloquialisms; but the underlying Greek original is the source of the greater number of its peculiarities; the colloquial elements, however, are not distinctive enough to enable us to determine the home of the translation (pp. 123-4).

In his introductory chapter on the general problem Mr. McIntosh naturally makes use of Dr. Kennedy's article referred to above, without adding much of his own. He would have shown more skill if he had digested his authorities instead of merely tabulating their opinions. A Latin scholar ought not to say that Peter Sabatier's great work was published 'at Remis' (*sic*); such a word as 'rendition' for 'rendering' may be an Americanism, but it ought not to appear in a work of scholarship. These, however, are minor matters. Mr. McIntosh has made a promising start on an important subject, and we hope that he will carry his study further.

G. A. COOKE.

Christ Church, Oxford.

ROMAN IDEAS OF DEITY.

Roman Ideas of Deity in the last Century before the Christian Era: Lectures delivered in Oxford for the Common University Fund. By W. WARDE FOWLER, M.A., etc. Pp. vii + 166. Macmillan and Co. 1914.

MR. WARDE FOWLER holds a unique place among writers on Roman Religion, in that he is not content with the collection of beliefs or even with the anthropological interpretation of rites, but has made the much more difficult attempt to penetrate behind them to the consciousness of the people who held these beliefs and performed the rites. In his *Religious Experience of the Romans* he traced this consciousness on its emotional side, showing how the Roman people were affected by their religion: in the present course of lectures—almost tantalisingly brief—he attempts to discover within the limits of a single century what were the current intellectual conceptions of deity among the educated classes and more particularly in the mind of the common people. To the casual reader the results may seem disappointing: the conceptions which Mr. Fowler presents to us are for the most part rather vague and nebulous, and there is a very manifest lack of coherence between them. But the reasons for this are not far to seek. In the first place, the last century of the pre-Christian era which Mr. Fowler has selected as his field was, from the religious point of view, as from many others, the most unsettled period in the history of Rome: the traditional religion had lost its force, except in the household worship, and in some aspects of the State-cult. Philosophy, in so far as it touched religious questions, maintained for the most part a critical and negative attitude; the Oriental cults had as yet a very insecure hold, and the worship of the Man-god, in the person of the Emperor, was in its infancy: it was no doubt just this coincidence of dying and nascent elements which Mr. Fowler found fruitful and attractive. Secondly, it was of the very essence of the genuine Italian religion to be vague and undefined in its

conception of deity, and though both Greek religion and Greek philosophy had to some extent sharpened the outlines—and in many cases distorted them—much of the ancient indefiniteness lingered on even in the minds of professed thinkers like Cicero and Varro. It is in fact a mistake to expect to find any clear-cut idea of a god or of divine power in the Roman mind, and we must be content with hints and glimpses where we can get them.

Such glimpses Mr. Fowler finds in four directions—(1) in the worship of the family, and especially in the conception of the *genius*; (2) in the position of Jupiter in the State-worship, in which he finds traces of monotheism; (3) in the cult of Fortuna as a world-power; (4) in the growing idea of the Man-god. On all of these subjects his work is full of illuminating suggestions and apt illustrations, and everywhere he adds to our knowledge, and opens up new fields of enquiry. Most readers will probably feel that the most original and suggestive of his views are those under the second and fourth of these heads. Let us, however, first glance at the other two. (1) Mr. Fowler emphasises, as he had already done in the *Religious Experience*, the vitality of the family worship, and in a very interesting section (pp. 17-22) points out that among the family *numina*, that which contained the germ of theology most conspicuously was the *genius* of the paterfamilias. Its essential connection with his individuality, gives to it a distinct notion of personality, which had a general theological value, and also paved the way, as he points out later (p. 90), for the deification of the Emperor; and in its more extended uses, of places, societies, and institutions, it brought out the idea of a vital force—a limited replica, as it were, of the notion of a cosmic power. What one misses in Mr. Fowler's account of the *genius* is a clear expression of what the original notion was in the household cult: sometimes it seems to be spoken of as a power resident in the head of the household himself; sometimes, es-

pecially when it is compared to the Greek conception of the *δαίμων*, as an external power protecting him. It would surely be historically true to say that in the genuine Roman religion the former was the conception: the *genius* was the *numen* in the paterfamilias, his power to continue the family, just as Vesta resided in the hearth and the Penates in the store-cupboard. Later on, and largely owing to the influence of the Greek notion of *δαίμων*, it became thought of as an external guardian, and so could be used of legions, schools, and colonies (p. 20). No doubt the average Roman of Cicero's time hovered between the two notions, but when we are trying to define theological conceptions we may fairly distinguish between them. (3) In his very interesting treatment of *Fortuna* (pp. 61-80), Mr. Fowler insists that for the best minds in the best periods she was thought of not as a blind or capricious force, like the Greek *Τύχη*, but rather as 'the *numen* presiding over the incalculable element in human life,' which man by his own *virtus*, the action of his free will, can to some extent both forestall and modify. *Fortuna* is thus at times (p. 73 ff.) almost identified with *natura* as the systematic working of law. 'But never quite so identified,' I should be inclined to add, and I cannot resist pointing out that the two passages in Lucretius (v. 77 and 107) which Mr. Fowler quotes for this identity do in reality exactly bring out the difference between the two conceptions. In the first,

praeterea solis cursus lunaeque meatus
expediam qua vi flectat *natura* gubernans,

he is dealing with the permanent unvarying motions of sun and moon: these are a matter of absolutely fixed and unchangeable law, which can be known and even, with certain reservations for an Epicurean, explained by man: they are therefore in the province of *natura*. In the second passage Lucretius is telling us that the end of the world may come at any moment to confirm his argument that the world itself is mortal—'quod procul a nobis flectat *fortuna* gubernans'—*fortuna* here, because though the end of the world is no less than the revolution of the sun

due to the operation of law, it is no recurrent predictable event, but the result of many complex processes which put it outside the sphere of human calculation. There we have, I think, exactly the real distinction between *natura* and *fortuna*: *fortuna* is not opposed to *natura*, it is indeed a subdivision of it, but it covers the workings of *natura* when they are beyond human calculation and therefore appear to us as luck or coincidence. This was exactly the notion of Democritus, though not of Epicurus, and I believe that Lucretius' return to the earlier idea was due to the current Roman conception which Mr. Fowler has so well brought out.

The two chapters on *The Idea of the Man-god* and *The Deification of Caesar* not only explain another route by which Romans arrived at a new theological conception, but form an important contribution to the study of a very difficult problem. In the earlier chapter Mr. Fowler insists strongly that the notion of a Man-god was wholly foreign to genuine Italian religious thought: the idea of the *genius* came nearest to it and could be deftly used to support it, as it was by Augustus, but could not of itself have developed into deification. On the other hand, by Cicero's time, through Greek and Oriental influences, Romans were familiar with the idea, and it had indeed been applied to great Roman commanders in the provinces: Mr. Fowler might have brought the notion even nearer home to Italy than he has by reference to the institution of the *Marcellia* in Sicily, and its absurd parody in the *Verria*, and the statue of Verres Soter (Cic. in *Verr.* II. II. 63, 154). In the later chapter the history of Caesar's deification is re-examined with great subtlety and penetration. Antony's attempt at deification before Caesar's murder was, Mr. Fowler thinks, wholly personal to him; it was based on the Oriental ideas with which he was familiar, was repugnant to Roman feeling and may even, as he suggests (p. 118), have been intended to entice Caesar to his downfall. Popular feeling did not follow at once on Caesar's death, but was roused later by the comet and the eclipse (p. 121), and

when it had once taken root was very carefully controlled by authority, striving always to correlate it with already accepted ideas. Here we have a very clear and probable narrative of the course of events. With the subsequent action of Augustus, both with regard to Julius' deification and his own, Mr. Fowler deals on traditional lines, holding that Augustus sanctioned the worship of Julius, but refused his own in his lifetime. The one difficulty here seems to be the attitude of the Court poets: in many familiar passages, among the Augustans, such as Virg. *Ecl.* i. 41-5 and Hor. *Od.* iii. 3. 12 (where Mr. Fowler allows the reading *bibit* on p. 128, but emphatically rejects it on p. 152), it is hard to resist the impression that the poets intended a present deification of Augustus. Mr. Fowler suggests (p. 126) that in such places we have a 'proleptic assumption' of divinity, but how does a 'proleptic assumption' really differ from a present attribution? Is it not safer to acknowledge that Court flattery went beyond the limits which Augustus had laid down for official acknowledgment and that, for all his public caution, their suggestions were not in private distasteful to him?

The most original and suggestive of the lectures is undoubtedly that on *Jupiter and the Tendency to Monotheism*. Mr. Fowler's contention, put briefly, is that the unique position of Jupiter in the State-cult seems to point back to a period of very early monotheism—such is attested in some of the religions of the Far East. From this polytheism was a degeneracy, and the monotheistic Jupiter was swallowed up in the many gods of the Italian religion, as we know it, to re-emerge in the Ciceronian age under the influence of science and philosophy. This is of course a momentous contention, and if it could be established for Roman and, as Mr. Fowler suggests, also for Greek religion, it would almost revolutionise the accepted history of their development. I can only here suggest some considerations which indicate that we ought to be very cautious about proceeding further on these lines. (1) The evidence for anything like a primitive monotheism in Italy is exceedingly small.

In early Rome the Jupiter of the Palatine settlement seems to hold no very commanding position: the Ides of each month, it is true, were sacred to him, but so were the Kalends to Juno. The only annual festival associated with him is the Vinalia, and that represents but a small department of the life of early Rome. Indeed it looks as if Mars meant more to the early Palatine Romans than Jupiter, and if we turn to the position of Jupiter in the Latin league, which Mr. Fowler emphasises, he seems to be to the undivided Latins what Mars was to the Palatine Romans and Quirinus to those on the Quirinal, *primus inter pares*, but not more. (2) Lucretius' monotheism, on which Mr. Fowler lays some stress, may be exaggerated. There is no doubt throughout the poems the sense of a force behind the workings of the world—which I should see perhaps more in such phrases as *natura creatrix* (II. 1116) and *perfica natura* (II. 1115) than in some which Mr. Fowler quotes—but when we speak of it as a 'vital force,' we must not forget that life itself was to the Epicurean only a peculiar form of atomic motion, and that 'nature' remains for him something essentially concrete and material: at any rate this has nothing to do with Jupiter. (3) Nor surely can we put much stress on the use of 'Jupiter' by Cicero and others to represent something like the 'world-spirit' of the Stoics; it is not the outcome of any belief associated with the State-cult, but a lax use, almost a metaphor, to express a nascent idea. I confess that I cannot yet see reason to depart from the belief that the old Roman religion is essentially a polytheism, or rather 'multinuminism,' and that it is philosophic speculation in the Ciceronian age which first gives birth to the new monotheistic idea. But the suggestion is infinitely important, and it is to be hoped that Mr. Fowler will develop it further.

It goes without saying that the lectures are full of the charm which Mr. Fowler always lays on us, and that no one will be able to read them without finding new and fascinating ideas.

CYRIL BAILEY.

Balliol College, Oxford.

ANCIENT TOWN-PLANNING.

Ancient Town-Planning. By F. Haverfield. 8vo. Clarendon Press, 1913. 6s. net.

PROFESSOR HAVERFIELD'S work appears at an opportune time, when town plans are being much discussed in other countries as well as our own, but it will not have a merely passing interest. It deals admirably with a subject which has not been treated before in a connected manner, and it must long remain an indispensable aid for students of the ancient world. The inclusion of very many plans and illustrations of ancient town sites is in itself a great boon. The material has been gathered from widely scattered sources, and has in great part been hitherto difficult of access, excepting within the walls of great libraries. Professor Haverfield's comments and criticisms take cognisance to the fullest extent of the literature pertaining to the subject, and are informing and judicious, whether he is testing the opinions of others or advancing his own. Some views which he puts forward about the growth of Pompeii are particularly interesting.

The problems which the theme presents are often of great complexity. The book recognises the readiness with which the rectangular arrangement of streets springs up independently in different lands and in different ages. The modern French towns in North Africa often resemble in this respect those in the same region of Roman age. The plan of New York bears no small similarity to some of those in this book. Old Barcelona is of irregular shape; the great new quarter is laid out in the fashion of New York or Priene. The latest light, however, on the Continent, witnesses to somewhat of a revulsion from straight lines. In new boulevards constructed in several places, Strassburg, for instance, curved lines are being deliberately adopted as being more beautiful. Professor Haverfield is properly cautious in dealing with current views about the passage from land to land of ideas concerning the planning of towns. He rightly points

out that Varro, who supposed that the Romans learned from Etruria the ritual proper to be followed on the foundation of a new town, is not known to have asserted that the internal construction of Roman towns reflected Etruscan models. Only the method of defining the town walls, and the 'centuriatio' and 'limitatio' of the surrounding territory, were referred by Varro to an Etruscan origin. Had he held the view commonly attributed to him, the history of Etruscan towns would have justified its rejection. The notion that regular town-planning came to the Romans from Greece via Etruria, which Nissen and many other scholars have maintained, has no solid foundation. I feel disinclined, on the evidence, to admit even what Professor Haverfield allows, that knowledge of the structure of Greek towns induced the Romans to render their own plans more regular. The development may well have been indigenous.

Several passages in the volume raise the question to what extent cities, particularly in Italy, were reconstructed or reorientated on the reception of new colonists, in the later period of the Republic, or the earliest age of the Empire. My impression is that this was of rare occurrence. The settlers, veterans for the most part, were sent to cultivate the land, and their dwellings would naturally be outside the walls, at all events in the main. A passage of Granius Licinianus describes how the old burgesses of Faesulae assailed the 'castella' of the new Sullan settlers. There would necessarily, however, be a re-measurement of the territory, and a delimitation of that portion which was left to the old inhabitants. This is attested in the case of several towns, for instance Arretium, where there were three classes of burgesses, the 'Arretini veteres,' 'Fidentiores' (Sulla's colonists), and 'Julienses' (planted there by Caesar or Octavian). When Caesar divided up the lands of Capua there was a new survey and measurement, but we hear nothing of any portion of the city having been assigned to the colonists, or of any remodelling of

the city as a consequence of the settlement. The exploration of Pompeii has not made it probable that the town itself was 'repeopled' (p. 63) by Sulla, though Nissen supposed that at that time the western wall was thrown down, to allow of an extension to receive the settlers. Until Augustus was firmly settled on the throne, there would be little money available for reconstruction. After that, the occasional beautification of Italian cities by Emperors had little or no connection with the settlement of colonists.

I append a few notes on various points. P. 13. The passage quoted from Vitruvius ii. 1 might have been more fully described; it supplies the strangest tale of town-planning on record. Dinocrates tendered to Alexander the Great a scheme for carving Mount Athos into the figure of a man; his left hand was to hold 'civitatis amplissimae moenia'; his right a 'patra,' which was to receive all the water flowing down the mountain and to pass it on to the sea. No wonder that Alexander the megalomaniac was delighted. P. 31. It is not unlikely that Timaeus was the authority of Diodorus for his statement about Thurii. If so, it carries us beyond the Roman age. P. 31. An interesting example of a city built, like Rhodes, with reference to water limits, is Amsterdam. The form so determined has been followed through centuries of expansion. It is said, as a result of the recent excavations, that when Ostia extended to the line of the coast, the direction of new streets was determined by the shore. P. 32. The passage of Strabo (p. 654), on which the view (rightly questioned here) is based that Hippodamus laid out Rhodes as well as Piraeus, is most vague. Not only is there no mention of the architect's name, but the authority is rumour (*ὡς φασίν*). P. 37. The earliest date here given for the appearance of an *ἀγοράνομος* in a Greek city is 350 B.C., but an inscription of Delos mentions one in 377. P. 47. One could wish for more information about some other partially explored ancient cities in Asia Minor, Perga for instance, which are known to have been constructed on rectangular plans. P. 48. The passage

of Diodorus (XX. 102) about the rebuilding of Sicyon by Demetrius, though rather carelessly worded, does imply that the city still retained the form then given to it. Its history in later Roman times makes it improbable that it ever underwent reconstruction. The remark is true that the Republican Government is not likely to have spent money on Sicyon; but Greek cities were sometimes reconstructed by aid of the Roman treasury in that age. Gabinius, at the instigation of Pompey, rebuilt more than one ruined Hellenic city in Syria. P. 74. Professor Haverfield regards a famous line attributed to Ennius by Festus (or rather Verrius Flaccus), in which 'Roma Quadrata' is mentioned, as 'clearly of much later date.' If the testimony of Verrius Flaccus is bad for this line, it must be equally bad for many others. It is true that the explanation of 'Roma Quadrata,' which is appended to the quotation, gives a meaning to the name which cannot have existed in the time of Ennius. It is said that 'Roma Quadrata' was the designation of a sort of 'mundus' which was situated 'ante aedem Apollinis.' I must, with Kornemann, regard this as a late 'Priestermärchen.' But the false interpretation does not necessarily discredit the authorship of the line. The theory that it was forged generations after Ennius, is intrinsically most improbable. P. 78. The current description of the arches often placed outside towns in the imperial period, as 'triumphal,' is unsuitable. Some of them were erected to celebrate triumphs, but this kind of arch became merely a conventional form in town architecture. An unsuccessful endeavour has been made to prove that these arches indicated 'coloniae.' P. 82. As to Aquileia, Professor Haverfield states that 'till its downfall, about 450 A.D., we hear no word of refoundation or wholesale rebuilding.' [The destruction by Attila occurred in 452.] The changes made by Maximinus Thrax in the city must have been considerable, for in an inscription (C.I.L. vol. v. 7989) he is called 'restitutor et conditor.' It had suffered severely at the hands of the Marcomanni. The extension of its

territory by 'Augustus need not, of course, indicate reconstruction. P. 106. As to Ammaedara, we have the testimony of Hyginus that its 'decumanus' and 'cardo,' as in a Roman camp,

ended in four gates and constituted the principal streets.

J. S. REID.

Cambridge.

THE TEXT OF FESTUS.

Sexti Pompeii Festi de Verborum Significatu quae supersunt cum Pauli Epitome.
Thewrewkianis copiis usus edidit
WALLACE M. LINDSAY. Teubner,
1913.

OF late years the great Leipsic firm has been issuing in a handy form certain texts which were often only accessible to the student in a library, yet are such as must lie on his own shelves if he is to realise their full value. I recently noticed in these columns the first volume of the *Corpus Agrimensorum*, edited by Thulin; before that we had the *Carmina Latina Epigraphica* of Buecheler, and Nonius edited in two volumes by Professor Lindsay. Now we have, from the same safe hand as the Nonius, the extant remains of the dictionary (if such it can be called) of Pompeius Festus. I write these lines in the throes of war-time, while our hopes of the power of learning and science to make war ever more and more impossible are being rudely shattered alike by German soldiers and German professors. But these two works of a British scholar, published by a German firm, will remain as evidence of an age of better international confidence.

The German firm made a good choice. Probably no scholar in Europe was better fitted to do this kind of work than Professor Lindsay, and to do it with unlimited devotion to the cause of true learning. He has been some twenty years at work on texts of this kind. In 1895 he edited, after the premature death of Mr. J. H. Onions, the work left by him on the text of Nonius; then came his edition of the same author for Messrs. Teubner; and since then he has edited Isidorus for the new Oxford texts. Like his friend Onions, he had come under the stimu-

lating influence of Henry Nettleship, the first scholar in this country to appreciate at their full value the Roman attempts at lexicography. It is quite needless to say that Professor Lindsay has executed his task with all his well-known accuracy and acuteness. Taking that for granted, I may be allowed to say a few words here about the work of Festus and its importance for all things Roman; for I notice that even in such a volume as the *Cambridge Companion to Latin Studies*, hardly anything is said of it.

When we talk of 'Festus,' we mean of course, the remains of an abridgment, made in the second century, of the great work of Verrius Flaccus *de Verborum Significatu*: the author of this abridgement was a *grammaticus* named Sextus Pompeius Festus, of whom we know little or nothing. Verrius Flaccus, who lived under Augustus and Tiberius, was tutor to the grandsons of the former, and may be considered the successor of Varro; he was no mere dry-as-dust, and his work was far more than a dictionary, so far at least as we can guess from the abridgment of it; his object was not only to preserve and explain words, but to rescue from oblivion the old rites, customs, and institutions, which they denoted. His book, if we had it complete, would be not only rich in value but extremely interesting: that may easily be guessed by anyone who will read straight through what remains of the compendium, as I have just done, after using it as a work of reference for more than thirty years. He will be astonished how much of our knowledge of Roman life and thought depends ultimately on this great work.

But of Verrius' work it cannot be said with strict truth that any part survives. Even the abridgment of it is mutilated: for the single extant MS.

of this (*Farnesianus*, in the Vatican), when first found near the end of the fifteenth century, was already in a melancholy condition. It began in the middle of letter M: up to that point all is lost of the dictionary, except what may have filtered through the works of other authors. Of the remaining portion three large fragments have also vanished, which were appropriated by a scholar named Pomponius Laetus soon after its discovery: but of these certain copies are extant, in particular one careful copy by Politian, which unluckily does not contain nearly all the missing part. And this is not all the melancholy story. The MS. was written in two columns on each page, and of these the outer ones have been ruined, either entirely or in part, by fire. Strange to say, however, the work of Festus was not destined to be thus rendered largely useless. At the end of the eighth century Paulus Diaconus, the author of a life of Gregory the Great, which has a good reputation, compiled for Charles the Great an epitome of the whole of Festus' compendium, compressing and shortening, but not re-writing, as we may gather from his own words in the introduction addressed to Charles. As we can compare what is left of Festus with this epitome, we know that in most cases the gist of the gloss is given by Paulus; on the other hand, only too many explanatory passages that to him seemed worthless, though they would be of the utmost interest to us, have been dropped out by him, and lost to us for ever.

What, then, is the work of an editor of Festus? Simply to elicit the writer's words, where doubtful or wanting, not

only from the one MS. and the copies of lost portions of it, but also from Paulus (whose own text is comparatively sound) and from conjecture based on knowledge. Not indeed to re-write, even where it might seem possible, the contents of the burnt pages: that indeed was done to a great extent by the last great editor, Otfried Müller, with the help of his predecessors of the sixteenth century, and here and there by Mommsen. Dr. Lindsay has wisely dropped out all this conjectural matter, so that the student who consults Festus is not biassed by the conjectures of others, but left to himself in using the mutilated parts—a far better plan. With all gratitude for the wonderful learning and ingenuity of these efforts of O. Müller, we are glad to find the text clear and clean once more. What we owe to Professor Lindsay, and also indeed to Thewrewk, the Hungarian scholar whose work passed into his hands, is the publication in a handy form of the combined text of Festus and Paulus, as established with the utmost care and pains by an expert of the highest repute, and the most unquestionable good sense and judgment.

Of the many further questions that arise in connection with Festus nothing need be said here; for the editor tells us that a second volume is to appear which will deal with other matters besides the text. We wish him good speed in this undertaking, nothing doubting, unless it be that a perverted German patriotism may refuse to work with a British editor.

W. WARDE FOWLER.

Kingham, Clipping Norton, Oxon.

SHORT NOTICES

Vives on Education. A translation of the *De tradendis disciplinis* of Juan Luis Vives, with an Introduction by FOSTER WATSON. Cambridge University Press, 1913.

WHAT is, and what might be, is again called to our minds by reading this

book. How much wisdom and how much sound common sense can be found written on the subject of education, how much plain idiocy seen in the practice of it! Hardly less striking is it to see, that the great men are in accord as regards all main principles of educating. Vives, Erasmus, Vittorio

da Feltre, Comenius, all alike see that education means to give scope to the natural faculties of the child, in the natural way, and to guide them; and yet schools are and have been chiefly planned as though to repress, and to put formality in the place of life. And at this very day we see England, supposed to be the land of freedom, smothered by a network of examinations, which take account only of the mechanical and dead part of school work.

I have never conversed with any teacher, man or woman, who had any life or originality, without hearing that these devilish inventions choke all the life out of their work; and they are making inveterate the intellectual faults which Vives and his like warn us to avoid.

In this book the whole process of education is surveyed; but I shall leave aside the more general questions, including morals, to call attention to the remarks on teaching as an art. In Vives' day, the fight between the grammarian and the humanist had already begun. Vives, who regarded the learning of languages as a means to an end, or rather two ends, self-expression, and the use of what the language could teach, had no mercy upon the formalist. 'When grammar teachers spend their time in trifling amongst the boys, who drag them into ineptitude and puerilities, as if by contagion, they lose all seriousness and moderation. They are compelled to attend to the faults of the boys, which are innumerable . . . so that they are almost driven to anger and ferocity; and thrust down in that pounding-mill, their common sense becomes greatly diminished.' But his method should be inductive: use first, rules afterwards if necessary, and all based on the spoken word. He would have us learn Latin as we learnt our own language, by daily use. Advocates of reform will find good support in Vives.

He gives a detailed course of study, including mathematics and history; he was perhaps the first to insist on the importance of contemporary history for the school. But his course is not aimed at making grammarians, but citizens and men of the world. All through he

regards the school as helping and helped by the home; he was not faced by our modern problem, how to supply the place of the home. He even discusses the salaries of teachers, and wishes to see them paid by the State. The salary should be, he says, one that a good man will desire, and a bad man despise.

It is not possible to conclude without reminding readers that we owe this book to Mr. Foster Watson, who has given us a whole library of educational books of the first importance. Not the least attractive is a translation of Vives' own *Dialogues for Schools*, in which we have a vivid picture of the schoolboy's life in that day.

W. H. D. R.

Remarques diverses sur les Théâtres romains à propos de ceux d'Arles et d'Orange.
Par JULES FORMIGÉ. 1 vol. 4to.
Pp. 65. 5 plates+13 text illustrations. Paris: Klincksieck (for the Imprimerie Nationale). 4 fr. 50.

M. FORMIGÉ starts from the theatres of Arles and Orange, which show much the same dimensions and styles of construction and which may (he thinks) have been built together at the time when the two *coloniae* were established—about B.C. 46. He proceeds to discuss a number of structural questions connected with Roman theatres in general, but especially illuminated by these two examples, such as the nature and uses of the 'orchestra,' the management of the *vela* and of the *aulaeum*, the distribution of seats and 'private boxes,' certain arrangements for scene-shifting, the value of 'acoustic jars,' and the like. We cannot here go into the details thus raised, but we may mention that M. Formigé seems inclined to fancy that a chorus figured in some at least of the Roman scenic performances, and that the laying out of the Roman theatre often shows traces of the presence of a chorus. The monograph is furnished with excellent plans and illustrations, and should be consulted by all who have to deal with Roman theatres, whether from the side of literature or of excavation.

F. H.

Caesaris et Hirti commentarii de bello Gallico. Ex recensione T. RICE HOLMES. 8vo. Pp. 249. Published by P. H. Lee Warner for the Medici Society. (Riccardi Press Books.) Boards, £1 is. net.

THIS book can be cordially recommended to all who wish to read a luxurious edition of the commentaries on the Gallic War, undistracted by notes. It gives us the latest recension of our greatest authority on Caesar, in which there are nine or ten changes from the text edited by him for the Clarendon Press only six months ago (cf. *Class. Quart.* viii. 164). It is a pleasure to find that the Riccardi series is to include the masters of Latin prose as well as poets. No praise can be too high for the type, paper, and appearance of this beautiful volume.

W. W. How.

Merton College, Oxford.

The Principles of Greek Art. By PERCY GARDNER, Litt. D. 1 vol. 8vo. Pp. xvii+352. 112 illustrations (in the text). London: Macmillan and Co., Ltd. 10s. net.

THIS book is a new edition, with changed title, of the author's *Grammar of Greek Art*, published in 1905. The whole has been revised and enlarged, two new chapters having been added, one dealing with portraiture, the other with funerary art. It is thus a republication, with improvements, of a book that has supplied a very genuine want for the student of general Greek archaeology, and as such it is to be very heartily welcomed. It is, indeed, a very illuminating companion to the study of Greek art.

We welcome the two new chapters, and particularly sympathise with the emphasis Professor Gardner lays in the one on the importance of the worship of the dead in Greece and the debt of Rome to the Hellenistic age in the other. His insistence on the fundamental difference in principle between Minoan and Greek art is also welcome. To our mind the most illuminating chapter of all is the one that deals with the

relation of coins to history. This, from so eminent a numismatist as Professor Gardner, is naturally to be expected.

We venture to criticise in one of two instances. On p. 51 the strange implication seems to be made that the fact of a so-called temple at Paestum having an uneven number of columns in front may point to its being, as far as use goes, no temple at all. In chapter xviii. the art history of the Judgment of Paris is described, and one misses a reference to Miss Harrison's delightful treatment of it in her *Prolegomena*. On p. 259, note 2, the statement is made that the illustrations of the Blacas Krater are untrustworthy, as they were made before it was cleaned. No mention is made of its republication—presumably since the cleaning—in Furtwängler-Reichold-Hauser, *Griechische Vasenmalerei*, third series, pl. 126. On p. 194 a krater at Bologna showing Theseus in the sea in search of Minos' ring is brought into close relation with Micon, and apparently dated at about that painter's epoch. It belongs in reality to the fourth century.

This brings us to the one serious criticism we have to make. Professor Gardner (p. 218 and throughout) still holds to the idea that Attic vase-painting practically died out after the fall of Athens, thus keeping to Milchöfer's antiquated dating. Surely this view has been quite disproved by Furtwängler, Nicole, and Hauser, and one may place Meidias fairly confidently at the beginning of the fourth century, and maintain that the Pronomus vase, for instance, and the late vases from the Crimea and the Cyrenaica show no signs of that decadence that used to be attributed to the Attic ceramic art of the fourth century. The idea, too, implied in the book that the South Italian wares took the place of the Attic, and were therefore after their beginnings an independent development is likewise false. All through the fourth century South Italian vases were profoundly influenced by the Attic.

Finally the presence of idealism in Greek art is dwelt on perhaps a little too insistently.

E. M. W. T.

Fordfield, Cambridge.

Die Anfänge der griechischen Philosophie von JOHN BURNET. Zweite Ausgabe aus dem englischen übersetzt von ELSE SCHENKL. 8vo. Pp. vi+243. Leipzig: Teubner, 1913. M. 10

STUDENTS of Greek philosophy owe an enormous debt to German scholarship; and translation has made its chief results generally accessible in this country. The corresponding export is more of a novelty; but Prof. Burnet's *Early Greek Philosophy* was eminently worthy of a wider recognition. Frau Schenkl has made it her aim not merely to render the substance, but to preserve the impression of the author's style. An English reader can only say that, perhaps for that very reason, she has been successful in producing a version which is singularly easy to follow.

The translation is, subject to slight modifications, a close reproduction of the 1908 edition. In one respect it is an improvement, since references to Dielo's *Vorsokratiker* have been added throughout, though not with entire consistency. The details, so far as I have examined them, have been carefully transferred, but a necessary note has been dropped on p. 317, and the reference to Xanthus on p. 30. On p. 107 *παρέλκειν* as 'beim Rudern schwindeln' will startle some readers. The ordinary view is to be preferred. There is nothing to show that Xenophanes used the word *παρέλκειν*; and even if he did, the notion of the moon as a 'passenger' in the boat, while the sun does all the work, is too grotesque to be probable.

A. C. PEARSON.

Die Hellenistisch-roeemische Kultur, dargestellt von FRITZ BAUMGARTEN, FRANZ POLAND, RICHARD WAGNER. (Mit 440 Abbildungen im Text, 5 bunten, 6 einfarbigen Tafeln, 4 Karten und Plänen). Pp. xiv + 674. Teubner: Leipzig und Berlin, 1913.

THIS volume is similar in style and treatment to its predecessor, *Die Hellenische Kultur*, of which the first and second editions were briefly noted in this journal (1906, p. 138; 1908, p. 193). A third edition, just issued, attests its

continued popularity or usefulness, and permits us to augur the like of its companion. Nor is it difficult to see why these books should have such a vogue in Germany and elsewhere. *Die Hellenistisch-roeemische Kultur* is an inexpensive book; it is uncommonly well illustrated; it combines in an historical narrative materials otherwise accessible only pigeon-holed in cyclopaedias or distributed among many separate works; it is in general up to date.

It is also, however, of unequal merit. Poland's portion (State, Society, and Worship) lacks at once the lightness of touch of Baumgarten's sections (Art and Architecture), and the maturity and grasp of Wagner's (Literature, Religion, and Philosophy). This one of the authors seems to have been hardly equal to his task either in style or knowledge or breadth of view. In this last particular his defect may be illustrated by the fact that whereas Baumgarten ends his account of 'Art in the Roman Provinces,' with an interesting section entitled *Die christliche Antike*, and whereas Wagner relates the genesis and early development of Christian ideas and writings to pagan thought and letters, Poland fails to attach the institutions of the Roman Empire either to those of the Church or to those of Byzantium.

The outstanding feature of the work is that it combines the Hellenistic with the Roman period in an organic way. In this respect no other history of culture known to us is to be put in the same class with it.

W. S. FERGUSON.

American School, Athens.

Veröffentlichungen aus der Papyrus-Sammlung der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek zu München. I. BYZANTINISCHE PAPYRI. 1 vol. 4to. Pp. x+203. One portfolio of facsimiles. Leipzig and Berlin: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 28.

WITH this volume begins the formal publication of one of the younger papyrus collections which have of late been multiplying so rapidly. The instalment here printed is part of a con-

siderable group of sixth-century documents found apparently at Elephantine and largely relating to the affairs of a family whose home was Syene. Other papyri belonging to the group have been acquired by the British Museum and are to be included in the next part of the Greek Catalogue; and occasionally, as might have been expected, fragments of the same document have found their way both to London and Munich. It is a pity that exchanges should not be arranged in such cases. On the whole, however, these texts are in excellent preservation. They consist for the most part of lengthy contracts, agreements for settlement of claims and for sales of house-property predominating. An interesting exception, which had already been utilized in J. Maspero's *Organisation militaire de l'Égypte byzantine*, refers to the matriculation of a recruit (No. 2); it is an acknowledgment by the officers of the *numerus* at Elephantine that they had received the certificate (*probatoria*) issued on the recruit's behalf by the *dux* of the Thebaid. The editing of the volume has been shared by Professors Wenger and Heisenberg, who have collaborated with most happy results, the latter being responsible for the transcriptions and translations, while the former's profound juristic knowledge finds scope in the commentaries. A special feature of this excellent publication is the accompanying portfolio of thirty-seven large facsimiles, in which the entire series of texts has been admirably reproduced.

A. S. H.

Thucydidis Reliquiae in Papyris et Membranis Aegyptiacis Seruatae. Collegit FRIDERICUS FISCHER. 8vo. Pp. 75. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1913. M. 3; in cloth, M. 4.20.

THIS slender 'dissertation' is useful, chiefly as providing a collection of all the fragments of Thucydides so far discovered in Egypt. The author's comments on them (written in clear, pointed Latin) amount to little more than indications of the few differences between the fragments and the received text, approvals of Dr. Hude or Mr. Stuart Jones according as the

course steered by each appears to him to deserve, and the remark that, while we are able now to recover some better readings than we had before, the History had obviously undergone a certain amount of corruption by the beginning of the second century A.D. Examples of this last are τοῦ μὴ ἐκφεύγειν (II. 4. 2), τῇ δωδεκάτῃ or rather τῇ ιβ' (II. 15. 4), and μετείχον (II. 16. 1), all occurring within a fairly short space. I think the author is right in retaining τῶν χρημάτων τῆς προσόδου (II. 13. 2) with the papyrus and Classen against Hude; but he should base this opinion not, as he partly does, on the evidence of the papyrus, but mainly on the ample, explanatory mood of the context. A more doubtful case is τὰ ὅπλα παραδοῦναι (IV. 37. 1) which, though clumsy and condemned by Krüger and Hude, is not offensive in language or sense, and appears in a piece of papyrus that has enabled us to make several noteworthy emendations of the codices. Another fragment (*Ox. Pap.* VI. 187), not available to Hude, gives us the important reading δικαιοσύνης for δικαιοῦμεν ἡ (V. 105. 1).

On the whole it must be agreed that the Egyptian papyri have so far done but little for the question of interpolation in Thucydides, except to suggest that the mediaeval MSS. show the History in very much the same state as it was in the second century A.D.

The present volume has one serious defect. It fails to display the number of the book along with that of the chapter and section of each passage as it comes under discussion.

W. R. M. LAMB.

5, Cambridge Terrace, Kew.

De clausulis a Flavio Vopisco Syracusio adhibit. SUSAN HELEN BALLOU. Pp. 1-106. Weimar, 1912.

Miss Ballou has had an interesting career. She is a B.A. of Chicago, where she gained a Fellowship in Latin literature. She has travelled extensively and spent some two years in Rome, where she worked on MSS. of the *Historia Augusta*. She went to Germany in 1910, and studied first at Göttingen and

subsequently at Giessen. She has now produced a substantial work, written in good Latin, upon the clausulae of Vopiscus, as a thesis for the degree of Ph.D. at Giessen. The fact that an American lady student at a German University has written a treatise on such a subject is a notable sign of the times.

It may be doubted whether Vopiscus deserves so much honour, also, if it is profitable to work in this way on a single author without reference to others. Miss Ballou's enthusiasm is however unmistakable and refreshing. She has examined minutely the chief MS. She attacks the standard edition—that of Peter—with boldness, and she makes emendations with a light heart.

There are indications that some of her views are taken from others without examination: thus she follows Cauer's theory of enclitic dissyllables without comment or discussion. Where her authorities differ, she is somewhat perplexed: thus on one occasion she pathetically remarks *Quid de hac re censeam incerta haereo* (p. 45). She has one noteworthy view which colours and, in the opinion of the present reviewer, vitiates her dissertation.

W. Meyer, after surveying a large number of authors belonging to the fourth and fifth centuries, pointed out the existence of what he calls a *cursus mixtus*. This is sometimes metrical as well as accentual, sometimes accentual only. Miss Ballou sets forth Meyer's theory fairly enough in Ch. IV, and recognises that a large number of clausulae in Vopiscus are purely accentual. She will not, however, acknowledge in him a *cursus mixtus*, but only *cursus mixti vestigia*. She, therefore, tries to explain most of his clausulae as metrical, even where the other hypothesis yields an easier solution. Thus, if Vopiscus sometimes neglects quantity, it is simple to consider *manu perfecit* as an example of $\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim$, the *cursus planus*. Miss Ballou prefers to scan *mīlītārī mānū pēfēctī*, making *manu* enclitic (p. 55). But surely the shortening of the *-u* in *manu* is due to the stress accent on the first syllable. She wishes to write *vehiclo* for *vehiculo* in *Antiochīam vehīculo* (p. 27), a perfect specimen of the *cursus tardus*

($\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim$): so she accents *medīa relīquēmus* (p. 46), where we have a case of the *cursus velox* ($\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim \sim$). One result of her theory is that she is constantly meeting with the heroic clausula ($-\sim -\sim -\sim$), which she emends ruthlessly, though now and then she passes it without comment—e.g., *nōmēn hābērēt* (p. 43). Here again the accentual theory solves the difficulty at once. In the *cursus* it is indifferent whether the third syllable in $\sim \sim \sim \sim \sim$ is long or short. Thus, while Terentianus Maurus assigns to the cretic a *sedes beata* just before the end, Gregory VIII. requires a dactyl in the same position. Miss Ballou's emendations, therefore, seem to be uncalled for. She herself admits (p. 41)

auctor quibusam licentiis prosodiacis nisus est quibus clausulae primo aspectu heroicae in alias formas facile transformantur.

It would be interesting to know why she leaves a vowel short before *sc*, *sp*, *st*—e.g., *adcommodatiorē stylo* (p. 36), *faventē spero* (p. 61), *summā sciendi* (p. 98).

ALBERT C. CLARK.

Queen's College, Oxford.

Companion to Roman History. By H. STUART JONES. With illustrations. Clarendon Press. 15s. net.

PUT briefly, this book contains the archaeology of Rome on a larger scale than is found in the well-known *Companion to Roman Studies*. The work is done with the utmost care for accuracy of detail, and accompanied by plans, cuts, and photographs. It is a scientific work, which the student of Roman life will find invaluable for his instruction, although it contains far more than is necessary for the ordinary reader of texts.

There are eight sections: Introductory, dealing with the origins, the land-system, town-building, roads; Architecture, with materials and methods of building, and all the typical structures; War, Religion, Production and Distribution, Money, Public Amusements, and Art.

The account of the pile-villages is excellent, and the author sees here the original plan which afterwards became

the camp: the camp, as we know, often became the mediaeval city in England and other provinces, which makes an interesting point for us moderns. The remarks on the principles of decoration (p. 62) are worth reading; and the curious may then examine the new Town Halls of our artistic age, and ask what principles are followed there: to the critical eye, modern ornaments seem to be stuck on anywhere with gum, whether they be Tudor beams an inch thick, or Renaissance still life. There is very little original in Roman architecture, but the fornix seems to be a Roman invention. The system of land-surveying and measurement, described by the *gromatici*, is also highly instructive, and may be new to many; but this, like all such technical subjects, illuminates the literature here and there. So with amphitheatres, *circi*, roads, drains, in all these topics the reader finds not only a clear and full account of the how and the why, but sidelights on ancient life.

In the sketch of Roman religion, if we have not the sympathetic touch that Mr. Warde Fowler gives, we have as before a thoroughly trustworthy account of the significant facts, illustrated from the remains of ancient art. For example, the account of marriage gives just what we want to know, and what we usually miss in the voluminous notes of commentators. So also in the rites of Mithras and other religious associations.

It is impossible to describe or to criticize such a mass of details in our space; but wherever I have examined the book with the inquiring mind of the learner, I have found what I wanted; everywhere, that is, except sometimes in the Index, which, full as it is, does not contain everything. It might have been worth while, for the sake of babes, to say what exactly were the names of the silver and copper coins most often found in collections: the names may be inferred, but they are not so clearly indicated as they might be. The prohibition of using anything but wood in the *pons publicus* is hardly likely to be due to the reason stated (p. 76). A bridge could be quite easily destroyed, even if it were put together with tenpenny nails.

W. H. D. R.

Morphologie Historique du Latin (Nouvelle Collection à l'Usage des Classes, XXXII.), par A. ERNOUT. Vol. I. Small 8vo. pp. xiii., 367. Paris: Librairie C. Klincksieck. Price 3 fr. 50 c.

FOR this Manual, a neighbouring volume of Niedermann's delightful little '*Phonétique Historique du Latin*,' a brief notice will suffice. M. Ernout tells anew the oft-told tale of Latin Linguistics, without, so far as we can see, adding much of his own. But he writes in an interesting style with all a Frenchman's *clarté*, and is free from the common fault of writers on this subject. They know Latin words only from the dictionary, not from the Latin authors. They find in their dictionary, let us say, '*bat, Interject.*' and proceed to search in other languages for affinities of this Latin Interjection, while, all the time, the word is a mere creation of Plautus' fancy (*Epid.* 95): '*At enim—bat enim! nihil est istuc.*' M. Ernout is not of the Bat-tribe; words do not, for him, exist only in dictionaries; he knows, and loves, Latin literature. But if he has leisure and opportunity for something more ambitious than this little manual, why does he spend his time in doing what has so often been done before?

W. M. LINDSAY.

Petronius: with an English translation by MICHAEL HESELTINE. Seneca, *Apocolocyntosis*: with an English translation by W. H. D. ROUSE. Heinemann and the Macmillan Co.

THIS Translation is one of the now familiar Loeb series. It may, I think, safely be said, without any disparagement of the series as a whole, that this is far and away the best volume in Mr. Loeb's collection. I should myself be inclined to say that it is the best translation that I know of an ancient author. Every page is full of clever and telling phrases, and the whole is so wonderfully natural and spirited that one marvels how so much vitality can go hand in hand with such close and excellent scholarship.

I have noted, however, one bad

mistake and one bad habit: and, lest I should seem wholly uncritical in my admiration of Mr. Heseltine's book, I will mention both. At 132 Mr. Heseltine renders *perfricata fronte* by 'after rubbing my forehead'—which is meaningless in the context: the Latin means, here as elsewhere, 'behaving in a brazen fashion,' 'bluffing.' At 71 *sestertium trecentiens* is rendered by 'thirty millions.' This, as Mr. Heseltine of course knows, is something like 120 times too much; and an English reader will be hopelessly misled. This bad habit Mr. Heseltine carries with him to a good many other places where he has to deal with sums of money.

At 46 *si resiliert* means, surely, 'if he shows a reaction from this taste': cf. *resiluit* in Seneca, *N.Q.* IV. a, l. 10. At 131 does not *peracto* go with *carmine*? At 41 could not Mr. Heseltine re-write the only clumsy sentence in his book—*dum haec loquimur e.q.s?* and might he not strike out an occasional 'damn my soul'—such phrases are mostly more striking than the Latin.

These are small blemishes in a translation which I could wish to see widely known (though I would not have all the world read Petronius). Mr. Heseltine's text is that of Buecheler, which combines immense merits with some obvious defects. I am tempted to make one critical suggestion. At 54 fin. Mr. Heseltine prints Scheffer's *vulneratum* for the *liberatum* of the MS.—a conjecture palaeographically little plausible. Is not the true correction *tuberatum*?

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College, Oxford.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. lx. S. Aureli Augustini Opera. Sect. viii., pars. i. Ed. C. F. VRBA ET J. ZYCHA. 8vo. Pp. xx+742. Vienna: Tempsky, 1913. M. 22.

PROFESSORS VRBA and Zycha have now published the first of the two sections of St. Augustine which they undertook. The second was published some

years ago, and they now give an index to both. This is Vrba's only contribution to the present edition; Zycha has been engaged upon it from the first. We are not told how the work has been divided between the editors. This volume contains five treatises, four dealing with the Pelagian controversy and the fifth, 'De Natura et Origine Animae,' with psychology, but with a view to the same debate. All were written between 412 and 420, and are businesslike arguments, the interest of which is chiefly technical. The MSS., as usual with Augustine, are many and good. In one case the editors do not venture to distribute them into families, and in all cases the cross-connections between the groups are numerous. The *Index verborum et locutionum* is long, but not so full on the grammatical side as in other volumes of the Corpus. It is not likely, however, that any locutions of interest are peculiar to these treatises. Some difficulty in the use of this edition will be caused by the fact that these volumes, containing only part of the anti-Pelagian treatises, are indexed by themselves, the remaining writings on this subject having been undertaken by other editors. But this concerns the subject-matter rather than the language of St. Augustine.

Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum. Vol. lxii. S. Ambrosii opera, pars v., recensuit M. PETSCHENIG. 8vo. Pp. xii+539. Vienna: Tempsky, 1913. M. 16.

THE veteran Professor Petschenig, after many other labours for the Vienna Corpus, is now taking a share in the edition of St. Ambrose. His *Expositio Psalmi cxviii.* (119, according to the English notation) was written between 386 and 388, and is an eloquent, if verbose, application of its teaching to practice, combined with a great deal of allegorical interpretation. It was an edifying work and was popular with the monks, so that MSS. are numerous. Dr. Petschenig uses eight ranging between the ninth and eleventh centuries as the basis of his text; seven more have been collated and eleven inspected. But he frankly confesses that he has not been able to classify them in families. This

does not matter much; the text is in a sound state and the matter so obvious (in a good sense) that there is little difficulty. The only index is one of passages cited, which seems to be well done. The classical references are not very numerous and are rather obvious; the editor fails to identify one—'ante nos quidam interesse dixit inter docentes atque doctores.' The former are self-appointed. The Biblical text is interesting, and widely different from that of the predecessor, St. Hilary of Poitiers, to whom Ambrose was considerably indebted. Here we find an extraordinary omission. There is no reference to Hilary in the index or elsewhere. Yet without Hilary's work, written some fifty years earlier and itself based on Origen, that of Ambrose could not have taken the shape it did. Hilary is much briefer and has much more serious thought. He is theological rather than hortatory. Naturally enough, Ambrose displaced him in popular favour as an exegete, just as Augustine displaced him as a theologian. No evidence of the obscurity into which the greater man has fallen could be more impressive than Dr. Petschenig's neglect.

E. W. WATSON.

Christ Church, Oxford.

Das rheinische Germanien in den antiken Inschriften. VON ALEXANDER RIESE. I Vol. 8vo. Pp. xiii + 479. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1914. M. 18, unbound; M. 20, bound.

THE object of this book is to furnish a student of the history of the Rhineland under Roman rule with a survey of the epigraphic evidence bearing on his subject, put together in a handy form, and classified in such a manner as to make its use easy. Altogether the volume contains a collection of nearly five thousand inscriptions (not all printed in full), embracing not only texts found in Germany, but any from other parts of the Empire which can be thought to bear on the matter in hand. Thus the military inscriptions include not only those referring to the troops which were actually stationed on the Rhine,

but others, mentioning regiments originally raised in Germany and afterwards sent elsewhere, and under the names of the different Rhenish tribes we find any inscriptions of tribesmen which have been found outside Germany.

No principle of classification ever perfectly satisfies anyone except its maker, but that adopted by Dr. Riese seems adequate for most purposes, and is supported by an excellent index. Certainly those who have spent weary hours tracing inscriptions through the unindexed pages of Volume XIII. of the *Corpus Inscriptionum* will welcome a book which should in most cases enable them to get the desired information with a minimum of trouble, and Dr. Riese deserves our gratitude for his enterprise in filling in this respect such a long-felt want.

The inclusion of inscriptions from other parts of the Empire, while undoubtedly necessary to fulfil the object of the book, was more difficult to carry out on a consistent system, and the method adopted is not perhaps beyond criticism. In classifying the texts dealing with regiments originally raised in Germany and afterwards transferred to other provinces, it would surely have been sufficient to give references to the various 'diplomata' mentioning them without adding extracts from these documents. It is doubtful whether any information is derived from such a fragment as '... Antoninus Aug. Pius . . . tr. pot. XI. . . . alis . . . quae appell. . . . I Cannef. c. R. . . . in Pannon. super. . . .' which could not have been equally well given by a reference to the 'diploma' and its date following the name of the regiment.

Similarly it would have been better either to print in full such an inscription as *C.I.L.* III. 600, the well-known career of Lollianus, or merely to refer to it. The extract given is extraordinarily uninformative, and the concluding sentence dealing with Lollianus' road-making activities in Macedonia has in any case nothing whatever to do with his command in Mesopotamia of a detachment of troops who had once been in Germany, which seems to have been the reason why his inscription was included.

Still, in all such selections, a great many inscriptions must come on the border-line, and Dr. Riese could say with truth that omissions are a far more serious error than superfluities.

He has certainly given us a very useful and scholarly book for which we have every reason to feel grateful.

G. L. CHEESMAN.

New College, Oxford.

CORRESPONDENCE

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

SIRS,—Could you find space for three brief quotations from two of the earliest elegiac poets of Greece? The first is from Callinus (730 B.C.) and the others from Tyrtaeus (650 B.C.). Both authors wrote quite 2,500 years ago, yet they have a curious present interest. The exhortation of Callinus might be addressed to ourselves, and the words of Tyrtaeus describe with a sort of prophetic exactness the work of all those who are fighting under Sir John French.

(1)

Μέχρις τεῦ κατὰκεισθε; κότ' ἄλκιμον ἔξετε θυμὸν,
ὦ νέοι; οὐδ' αἰδῆισθ' ἀμφιπερικτίονας
ὦδε λίην μεθιέντες; ἐν εἰρήνῃ δὲ δοκεῖτε
ἵσθαι· ἀτὰρ πόλεμος γαῖαν ἅπασαν ἔχει.

2. ἀμφ. τοὺς ἀποίκους τοὺς πάντου πέραν
αἰνῖτται. Schol. τὰ νεώτερα ἔθνη. R. K.

(2)

Ξυνὸν δ' ἐσθλὸν τοῦτο πόλῃ τε παντί τε δήμῳ
ὅστις ἀνὴρ διαβῆς ἐν προμάχοισι μένῃ
νωλεμέως, αἰσχρῶς δὲ φυγῆς ἐπὶ πάγχυ λάθεται,
ψυχὴν καὶ θυμὸν τλήμονα παρθέμενος.
αἴψα δὲ δυσμενέων ἀνδρῶν ἔτρεψε φάλαγγας
τρηχείας, σπουδῇ δ' ἐσχεθε κῦμα μάχης.

2. διαβῆς, 'sc. La Manche' doct^{mus} Poincaré.
Alii aliter.

6. τρηχείας, epitheton notans feritatem incredibilem (Editores Belgici).

(3)

Οὐδέ ποτε κλέος ἐσθλὸν ἀπόλλυται οὐδ' ὄνομ' αὐτοῦ,
ἀλλ' ὑπὸ γῆς περ ἔων γίγνεται ἀθάνατος,
ὅντιν' ἀριστεύοντα μένοντά τε μαρνάμενόν τε
γῆς πέρι καὶ παίδων θοῦρος Ἄρης ὀλέσῃ.

T. L. A.

11, Clyde Road, West Didsbury,
Manchester.

BOOKS RECEIVED

Publishers and Authors forwarding Books for review are asked to send at the same time a note of the price.

* * * *Excerpts and Extracts from Periodicals and Collections are not included in these Lists unless stated to be separately published.*

Appleton (R. B.) *Fabulae, virginibus puerisque aut narrandae aut recitandae.* 7½" × 5". Pp. x+180. London: G. Bell and Sons, Ltd., 1914. Cloth, 2s.

Arnold (W. T.) *The Roman System of Provincial Administration.* Third edition, revised by E. S. Bouchier. 7½" × 5". Pp. x+284. Oxford: B. H. Blackwell, 1914. Cloth, 5s. net.

De Ducibus. Selections from Cornelius Nepos. By W. G. Butler. 6½" × 4½". Pp. viii+124. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914. 1s. 6d.

Murray (G.) *Hamlet and Orestes: a Study*

in Traditional Types (Annual Shakespeare Lecture). 9¾" × 6¼". Pp. 26. Oxford: University Press, 1914. 1s. net.

Noctes Latinae. By W. Madeley. Macmillan's Elementary Classics. 6" × 4". Pp. vi+166. London: Macmillan and Co., 1914. 1s. 6d.

Plautus. Five plays translated into English verse by Sir R. A. Allison. 9" × 6". Pp. xxi+318. London: A. L. Humphreys, 1914. Cloth, 7s. 6d. net.

Sharp (D. S.) *Epictetus and the New Testament.* 7¾" × 5". Pp. xii+158. London: C. H. Kelly, 1914. Cloth, 2s. 6d. net.

The Classical Review

DECEMBER, 1914

ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS

PLUTARCH, *MORALIA*.¹

Plutarch, *Moralia*. Bernardakis. 7 vols.
1888-1896. Teubner Text.

7E. πὼς ἀλλοτρίοις should follow πὼς φίλοις.

8B. ὧν ἑκάτερος (which is not to be altered to ἄτερος with Wyttenbach and others) is slightly out of place. Put it after Συρακόσιος and there ceases to be any difficulty, for Archytas, like Dion, was an associate of Plato.

9A. The present κλαυθμυρίζωσιν is needed.

13B. Flatterers (κόλακες) of youth are spoken of as ὡς ἐκ λυρικῆς τέχνης ἐπὶ τοὺς νέους ἀγόμενοι. λυρικῆς is clearly wrong and has puzzled scholars a good deal. Does it stand for αὐλικῆς, a courtier's art? A and Λ are very often confused.

21B.

δεινὸς γὰρ ἔρπειν πλοῦτος ἔς τε τὰ βατὰ καὶ πρὸς τ' ἄβατα χῶπόθεν πένης κ.τ.λ.

This is usually corrected to ἔς τε τᾶβατα | καὶ πρὸς τά—, leaving it very doubtful what βατα stands for (βάσιμα, βέβηλα, which gives an anapaest in the second foot). I would emend Sophocles' lines rather differently :

ἔς τε τὰ βατὰ καὶ
πρὸς τᾶβατ' <ἐστί>.

¹ A few other notes on the *Moralia* will be found in a scattered form in my *Aristophanes and Others*: see the *Index* under *Plutarch*.

τὰ ἄβατα should certainly come second, not first, if it can. χῶπόθεν seems to me right: the words describe an awkward and difficult place.

41A. δὲ τὸν μὲν ἔπαινον ἀφελῶς τοῖς λέγουσι, τὴν δὲ πίστιν εὐλαβῶς προὔεσθαι τοῖς λόγοις.

ἀφελῶς is quite senseless here and represents ἀφειδῶς. Δ and Λ get confused like A and Λ (13B above).

48E. τῷ σφόδρα φιλεῖν ἑαυτὸν . . . φάσκοντι συγγνώμην ἅπαντας ὁ Πλάτων διδόναι φησί.

May one guess that φάσκοντι stands for δοκοῦντι, miswritten under the influence of the coming φησί?

62D. οὐ διδοὺς ἑτέρῳ τόπον οὐδὲ χώραν διακονίας (of a κόλαξ). τόπον and χώραν being the same thing, I conjecture that one of them, probably χώραν, stands for χρόνον.

87D. Before εὐλαβούμενον ζῆν something has been lost, ποιῶν, or ποιεῖ γάρ, or to that effect.

90C. δι' ἀσθένειαν θυμοῦ.

θυμοῦ, which makes no sense here, is due to θυμοῖς in the line before. Plutarch may have written λογισμοῦ, but various words would do.

94E. For καὶ γάρ read ὥς γάρ. οὕτως calls for something of the sort.

96D. τὴν αὐτῆς κοινωνίαν.

I do not think Plutarch allows the personal pronoun in this place. Read ταύτης or move αὐτῆς.

109D. In the verse οὐκ ἦν γὰρ ζῶειν καλὸν αὐτῷ οὐδὲ γονεῦσι it is fairly clear that we should read αὐτῷ καλόν.

110A. It is odd that Epicharmus' tetrameter has not been corrected to a proper metrical form by writing ἦνθεν for ἦνθε—συνεκρίθη καὶ διεκρίθη κάπηνθεν ὅθεν ἦνθεν πάλιν.

119E. προειληφέναι is unsuitable and simply due to προειλήφασιν immediately following. ὑπειληφέναι would do (so Madvig, I find), or any word with that sense.

127C. οἱ ἀγαθοὶ ναύκληροι.

Not ἀγαθοί but a disparaging epithet is required by the context. Very unlikely words have been suggested, ἀθλιοι, ἄθαιοι, ἄπλοιοι. ἀμαθεῖς or ἀνόητοι would seem more suitable.

140B. Read τοῦ (for τὸ) συνακολασταίνειν—οὐ μεταδιδόασιν. The verb takes a genitive just below and—in this sense—always.

152D. οὐπω γέγραφας ὅτι ὅμοιον οἰκέτας μὴ μεθύειν, ὡς ἔγραψας Ἀθήνησιν οἰκέτας μὴ ἐρᾶν μηδὲ ξηραλοιφεῖν.

ὡς might go with something like ὅμοιον, but ὅτι ὅμοιον makes no sense. Wytttenbach ὡδε (here, I think) νόμον, but ὡδε was not at all likely to appear as ὅτι. ὅτι νόμιμον is not likely, because νόμιμόν ἐστι μὴ . . . would mean *it is lawful, permissible, not to do so and so*. ὅμοιον is perhaps not a simple corruption, but due to the following ὅμοιον (or ἀνόμοιον, as Wytttenbach rightly says it should be), and in its place ἀπειρημένον may be conjectured.

171E. Does μᾶλλον stand for ἀλλήλαις?

181C. νῦν, ἔφη, κ.τ.λ. νῦν by itself seems wrong. νῦν οὖν or νῦν γε?

182C. ἔστω for ἔσται?

Ib. ἐπεὶ δέ ποτε χειμῶνος ἐν τόποις σπανίζουσι τῶν ἐπιτηδείων ἠνάγκασε καταζεύξαι, κ.τ.λ.

Antigonus is taken to be the subject of the verb. But it is fairly certain, I think, that we should read ἠναγκάσθη, or else χειμών.

Ib. D. Without knowing that Cobet had done the same, I have before corrected μαστιγοῦσθαι to μεμαστιγῶσθαι.

185A. πότερον <ἂν> ἤθελες, like ἐβούλετ' ἂν. In 188D write again <ἂν> ἤθελεν. ἂν has already been added to ἡξιούμεν in 220E.

190A and 221F. οὐδ' εἰ has but little point. Is it a corruption of νῆ Δί' εἰ, the νῆ Δία found in 212E and other versions of the story cited by Wytttenbach?

191B and 211F. ἥρκει for ἄρκει.

Ib. D. (τοῦτό μοι μνημεῖόν ἐστι). Even without 215A, where the same story recurs, it would be plain enough that we want ἔσται.

In 195A we should probably read λυσίτελες ἔσται.

Just in the same way immediately above (191D. παρατάξας . . . καὶ πρὸς ἴσους ἴσοι ἀγωνισάμενοι ἐνίκησαν), common sense, the use of the exact words in 215A, and the double hiatus all show that ἴσοις ἀγωνισάμενος ἐνίκησεν should be read.

200A. τριβόλοις σιδηροῖς? μὴ σύ is no doubt (Wytttenbach) another version of μέσον.

Ib. C. Has it really not been seen that we should read ἐπαγγελλομένου?

206B. μᾶλλον ἂν ἐβουλόμην πρῶτος ἐνταῦθα εἶναι ἢ δεύτερος ἐν Ῥώμῃ.

I have suggested βουλόμην in these words as they appear in Caesar's *Life* (Class. Quart. 4. 19,). The imperfect implies that he actually was, or had been, second at Rome, and this cannot well be right.

208B. πρὸς τὸν εἰπόντα (asked) πῶς ἂν τις ἀδορυφόρητος ὦν ἄρχειν δύναίτο, 'ἐὰν οὕτως,' ἔφη, 'αὐτῶν ἄρχῃ, ὥσπερ οἱ πατέρες τῶν υἱῶν.'

Read ἀστῶν or rather τῶν ἀστῶν, the confusion being quite common.

210A. ἀντὶ ταύτης τῆς διαίτης . . . τὴν ἐλευθερίαν ἀνόμεθα.

The suggested μόμεθα (Valckenaer) does not seem quite good. We want some verb of 'getting' rather than 'desiring.' I should think of πώμεθα, if there were any example cited of the present tense of that verb (πέπαμαι, etc.), it being specially Doric; and it seems not unlikely. We might think of ὠνούμεθα, possibly of κτώμεθα.

Ib. B. ἄλλον δὲ προτρεπομένου ἀνίστασθαι καὶ λέγοντος διὰ τὸ τῆς τύχης ἄδηλον μήποτε τούτου καιρὸς γένηται, 'ἀλλ' ἐγώ,' εἶπεν, 'ἐμμαντὸν ἐθίζω λέγων ὥστ' ἐν μηδεμιᾷ μεταβολῇ μεταβολὴν ζητεῖν.'

The general sense appears fairly well from the context, but λέγων cannot be right and μήποτε . . . γένηται has no construction. The former stands for ζῶν, or something similar, corrupted perhaps through λέγοντος preceding. To supply a construction we might insert before μήποτε something like φυλάττεσθαι δεῖν.

213B. μᾶλλον τοὺς Μήδους λακωνίζειν.

I was wrong before in proposing to alter the parallel passage in *Vit. Artax.* 22, as this and *Ages.* 23 show.

215E. αἱ κατοικοῦσαι, not αὐ κατοικοῦσι.

219F. In εἰ μὴ τὰς πρὸς αὐτὸν διαλλαγὰς ποιήσονται, the article is surely strange. τινάς? ταχύ?

220F. ταῦτόν ἐστι <τῷ> . . . μάχεσθαι.

222A. Wyttenbach proposed αὐτὸς αὐτόθι for οὗτος οὔτοι. αὐτόθι may be right, though αὐτοῦ would perhaps be better. But there is no point in αὐτός, and, as οὗτος and οὐ get confused, we might think of an interrogative οὐκ. On the other hand, in 222D I think οὐχ οὕτω may be a mistake for ὅτι οὕτω.

224C. ὅσον γὰρ εἴη πρᾶγμα, τοσοῦτον καὶ ὁ λόγος ὃν χρῆσαι.

εἴη is scarcely grammatical. Either read ἂν ᾗ or put the εἴη before καὶ ὁ λόγος, understanding it in the semi-imperative sense which the optative has occasionally in prose (*Xen. An.* 3. 2. 37; *R. Eq.* 1. 8; *Plato Laws* 726 and several other places) and oftener in verse. τοσοῦτον should of course be τοσοῦτος. χρῆσαι might be one of several things, χρήσει, χρήσαι' ἂν, χρῆσθαι δεῖ.

Ib. F. ἐρωτηθεὶς ποίαν τις ἂν πόλιν οἰκήσας ἀσφαλῶς οἰκοίη.

Probably οἰκίσας. This is suggested both by the use of the aorist and by the futures following, which would naturally be presents, if it were a question of settling in some existing state that had a character already formed.

225B. οὕτω ought, one would think, to go in sense with ὀλίγων or πολλούς. In that case it should be moved.

226E. No doubt οὐδέ-οὐδέ has been corrected before now to οὔτε-οὔτε.

Ib. F. Logic requires γάρ for δέ after ἐκἀκίζον. The two particles are apt to get confused. In 262B write τοῦτο δέ for τοῦτο γάρ.

227C. ὅπως ἂν μετριάzoιεν . . . καὶ . . . ἔχωσι.

I do not know if this syntax can be paralleled in the Plutarchian corpus. Without ἂν it would not be difficult.

228A. Is not something missing after ζητοῦντα?

Ib. C. I can hardly believe ἐκτίνει for ἐκτίσει to be right, though it is found in the *Life* too (49D). As there was no law on the subject, the present tense cannot answer to our 'under the law he pays so-and-so.'

Ib. E. περὶ τοῦ πένθους καὶ τῆς ἰερούργιας.

Ib. F. ἦν δέ should apparently be εἶναι δέ in spite of the *Life* 54A.

230B. Νίκανδρος, εἰπόντος τινὸς ὅτι κακῶς αὐτὸν λέγουσιν Ἀργεῖοι, 'οὐκοῦν,' ἔφη, δίκην τίνουσι τοὺς ἀγαθοὺς κακῶς λέγοντες.

But this is the offence itself, not the punishment. The punishment for speaking ill of the good is that you have to speak well of the bad. Read therefore something like τοὺς κακοὺς ἀγαθὰ (possibly ἀγαθοὺς, or even ἀγαθῶς (*Aristotle*) λέγοντας.

231E. Either βαδίζω or βαδίζειν. In 232E κομᾶς should be κομᾶ, unless we are to read τίνας for ἄς (cf. next story); in 234D πεποιήκε for ἐπεποιήκει, unless ὅτι or ὥς has been lost after ἔλεγον.

232E. ἐπαινοῦντός τινος τοὺς ἀρίστους μαχητάς, Λάκων εἶπεν 'ἐν Τροίᾳ.' This is too incoherent to be right. As no one would praise 'the best fighters' in the abstract, ἐπαινοῦντος may be the seat of error. Should we read ἐπιζητοῦντος? Even so ἐν Τροίᾳ is not quite natural, and there may be some greater fault.

234D. ὁποῖος καθίστης has been emended by J. J. Hartman to κα ἴης, which may be right. I had previously

thought of some form of βαδίζω. In Aelian V.H. 9. 3 I have elsewhere suggested καθίζων for βαδίζων, and in Pherecr. fr. 36 the MSS. vary between the two words. Here in Plutarch we have βαδίζοντι following. *οποῖός κα βαδίξης* would be the natural thing.

In what follows, *τὼς δὲ λαγῶς ἐπὶ τῇ σκηνᾷ θηρεύομεν*, Bernardakis proposes *τῇ εὐνᾷ*. Rather *ἐπὶ τὰς εὐνάς*, or *ἀπὸ τὰς εὐνάς*.

237D. The first *ὅπως* (*ὅπως τῶν αὐτοῦ*) seems to be a mistaken anticipation of the second and perhaps to have taken the place of *καί*. From editors' notes it does not clearly appear whether *ὅπως* or *ὥσπερ* is in the MSS. *ὥσπερ* would come from the sentence before.

238E. *μετέιχε* (twice) is undoubtedly a blunder for *μετέχει*. This confusion occurs sometimes.

263E. *ἢ οὐκ* should be *ἢ ὅτι οὐκ*.

272C. Write *οὐκ ἔλαττον δὲ τούτου καὶ τὸ τοὺς κ.τ.λ.*

275A. *καρπῶν ἀρετῆς καὶ* (not *ἢ*) *γεωργίας*.

283C. <ἦ> *ἐξουσία*. H lost after N.

It is a very violent expression for anyone on the popular side to use, if he says that a tribune of the *plebs* should *καταπατεῖσθαι* *be* (or *let himself be*) *trampled on*, when he merely means that the tribune should be modest and unassuming, not rival the consular dignity. Only enemies of the people could want to trample on him, and Curio would not wish them to have their way. The sense is expressed a line or two below by *ἐκταπεινοῦται τῷ σχήματι*. Is it possible that *καταπατεῖσθαι* conceals something like *καὶ* (*even*) *ταπεινοῦσθαι* or *καταταπεινοῦσθαι*?

285B. *ἄλλ' ἢ τὸ γῆρας τὴν Κύπριν χαίρειν ἔᾶ*.

In this verse of Euripides *ἄλλ' ἢ* is obviously wrong. As *ἄλλος* and *ἄλος* get confused, should we write *ὄλην*?

290D. *τοῖς τὸν ὑπέρτατον . . . εἰληφόσι θεραπεύειν θεόν*.

Surely *εἰληχόσι*. The same mistake occurs in Ar. Pol. 7. 1. 1323^b 15 (some MSS.) and elsewhere. *λαμβάνω θεραπεύειν* is, I think, not even Greek.

294B. Madvig *ἐμφανής* for *ἀφανής*. Rather perhaps <οὐκ> *ἀφανής*.

295A. Write *μνήμην καὶ δόξαν . . . καταστήσαι* for *καταστήναι*.

306B. *ἡρεμίας ὑπαρχούσης* is the phrase used to describe the state of things when Othryades was left alone after the famous fight of Spartans and Argives. The regular word for being alone is *ἐρημία* (e.g. 376C *διέτριβεν ἐν ἐρημίᾳ*), and there can be no doubt that we should read that here.

307A. Insert *σύν* or *ἅμα* before *τῷ ἄρματι*.

308F. Insert *στρατηγόν* after *ἐχειρότόνησαν*, as in E.

316C. *κατηγορεῖται δ' ἀρετῇ μὲν ὡς καλὸν μὲν ἀναφελές δέ, τύχη δ' ὡς ἀβέβαιον μὲν ἀγαθὸν δέ*.

Both symmetry and the need of putting the more important word with *δέ* require us to transpose *ἀγαθόν* and *ἀβέβαιον*.

317C. Constant Greek usage requires another transposition here, *ὥσπερ ἀπὸ σκοπῆς τοῦ προβλήματος*, not *τοῦ π.* before *ὥσπερ*. Cf. 321C, 323E.

324F. *ἵνα οὖν μὴ καίρῳ δοκῇ, νόμῳ δὲ λαμβάνειν ὁ ἀνὴρ μὴδ' ὡς ἀπεγνωκῶς τὴν πόλιν ὅπλοις ἀρχαιρεσιάζῃ τὰ τοῦ στρατοῦ σποράδος καὶ πλάνητος*.

The latter half of this is very seriously wrong. One thing it is not difficult to put right. Some verb like *ἀνασφύζειν* *to recover* has been lost before or after *ὅπλοις*; *τὴν πόλιν* depended on it, and at present *ὅπλοις* too has no construction at all. The rest is less easy to cure. The general sense makes it certain that *ἀπεγνωκῶς* does not refer to Camillus, as Madvig's *ἀρχαιρεσιάζεται* presupposes, but to the people. Any feeling in Camillus' own mind is not at all to the point just here. Neither can *ἀρχαιρεσιάζῃ* here mean *canvass*, for there was no canvassing to be done nor was Camillus the man to do it. It is natural to think of *ὁ δῆμος* as the subject of *ἀπεγνωκῶς ἀρχαιρεσιάζῃ*; in that case those words (*ὁ δῆμος*) and others have been lost before *τά*. With *τά* again one thinks of *μέρη* or *μόρια*. But *ἀπεγνωκότα . . . τὰ μέρη* or *ἀπεγνωκός . . . τὸ πλῆθος* does not seem very likely. Finally the adjectives at the

end seem too loosely attached; but that depends on the other words.

326A. We ought to accept Abresch's interchange of διαφθαρήναι and συγχυθῆναι: the former word is certainly wanted to apply to ὑπομνηματισμούς. Probably a participle in the sense of *composed* (e.g. γεγραμμένους) or *preserved* should follow or precede ὑπομνηματισμούς. The sense of τίθεμαι is also incomplete. Read <ταύτης> τίθεμαι, *I put down to chance*. So perhaps in 319F we should read τῆς τύχης. In B, a few lines below, the ὥς before πρόφασις should probably be καί. καί and ὥς are well known to be often interchanged.

327B. Ἰνδῶν πληγαὶ καὶ βίαι θυμῶν. θυμουμένων? θυμῷ καὶ βίᾳ occurs a little below.

Ib. D. Alexander conceived the idea of universal empire τοῖς τρισμυρίοις οἶεσθαι πεζοῖς καὶ τετρακισχιλίοις ἱππεύσι πιστεύσας.

Nothing good has been made of οἶεσθαι. After πιστεύσας we should expect any infinitive to give the sense of 'trusting to *get, win*,' and then οἶεσθαι naturally suggests οἶσεσθαι, this being a common use of φέρομαι. But it might be some other word, e.g. κτήσεσθαι.

328B. Read καὶ ἀφ' ὧν . . . καὶ ἀφ' ὧν, not ἧ. This is plain in itself and further shown by the οἷς εἶπεν κ.τ.λ. below.

Ib. E. τέλεσι has been questioned, but it seems to have the special military sense, suitable here, of *companies* of men.

334E. ἐβουλόμην ἂν μᾶλλον ἀπολωλέναι μέρος τῆς βασιλείας.

Rather ἀπολωλεκέναι *to have lost*.

πάντων οἰόμενος δεῖν περιεῖναι, τοῦ δικαίου δ' ἡττᾶσθαι is incomplete until we read (say) ὅπλοις μὲν πάντων or make some other addition. I have elsewhere suggested πάντων <τῶν ἄλλων>.

336B. Read ὁ (for εἰ) μὲν γάρ. In 347B ὁ stands very similarly.

347B. It is difficult to see how ἄλαστον ἀγῶνα could grow out of the πολλὸν τὸν ἀγῶνα in Thuc. 7. 71: it points to

another reading or a lapse of memory. ἄλαστον itself too is hardly possible, and must stand for some other word. Bernardakis suggests πλείστον, but would πλείστος ἀγών instead of μέγιστος ἄ. be Greek? May it have been θαυμαστόν? θ might be absorbed in the very similar σ ending the word before, and λ gets confused sometimes with both μ and ν. But this is a very doubtful conjecture.

Ib. F. Read ἐγγὺς οὖν for ἐγγὺς οὖν, οὖν being hardly in place. Cf. on 181C.

Ib. Menander said 'my comedy is ready. I have arranged it all, and I have now only αὐτῇ τὰ στιχίδια ἐπᾶσαι.' ἐπᾶσαι does not seem to have been questioned, but it must be wrong, any use of ἄδω being quite unsuitable here. Perhaps it is only an accidental misreading of ποιῆσαι. Or should we read ἐπιποιῆσαι? The second or third syllable would easily fall out.

349F. ὅτε Καρκίνος Ἀερόπη συνῆν ἢ Ἐκτορι Ἀστυδάμας.

Aerope and *Hector* are plays exhibited by the two poets and συνῆν must conceal some word appropriate to this. There is no evidence that συνιέναι ever = ἀγωνίζεσθαι in general, or we might think of συνῆει. Perhaps ἡνήμερει, an almost technical word in this case.

351F. θεῖος and ὄσιος are so often confused that Bernardakis' ὀσιώσεως for θειώσεως is extremely probable, but his construction for it will not do. If right, it must have been governed by some word now lost, perhaps χάριν or ἔνεκα, perhaps a participle. The participial genitives may then agree with it, but Madvig's κολουύουσα . . . ἐθίζουσα is obvious and attractive.

355A. τὸν γάρ . . . Ὅσιριν ὀφθαλμῷ καὶ σκῆπτρῳ γράφουσιν . . . τὸν δ' οὐρανὸν ὡς ἀγῶν δι' αἰδιότητα καρδία θυμὸν ἐσχάρᾳ ἐποκειμένης.

In Wytttenbach's parallel passage θυμιατήριον answers to ἐσχάρᾳ here and does not seem to throw any light on θυμόν. The necessity of avoiding hiatus and the form of the whole sentence suggest that the word conceals some verb or other, and, that being so, σημαίνουσιν abbreviated seems possible. σ and θ were written so much alike that

the confusion is well known. The misreading is not worse than several others in the singularly corrupt text of this treatise.

355E. τῇ μὲν <οὖν>, or <καὶ> τῇ μὲν?

360B. ὑμνοῦνται <αἱ> πράξεις, as in the next clause.

361E. After πανταχοῦ μὲν a word or two have been lost parallel to δυνάμενοι μέγιστον.

362C. διὸ κ.τ.λ. There is no sense here in 'for which reason.' What we want is διότι *because*, adopting πάντων . . . ἐπιλανθάνεσθαι from Wyttenbach. For διότι with infinitive in *oratio obliqua* cf. Herod. 3. 55.

364E. δῆ should follow τίνα.

366E. βοῦν γὰρ Ἰσιδος εἰκόνα καὶ γῆν. κατὰ γῆν on earth?

377C. μῆδ' ἔλη μῆδὲ λωτοὺς μὴ θεοποιῖαν λέγοντες.

Wyttenbach's μῆδὲ πόαν is a much better substitute for μὴ θεοποιῖαν than either μῆδὲ χέδροπα or μῆδ' ὅτιοῦν (Bernardakis). Nearer still to the text, especially when we remember that ρ and ι sometimes get confused, would be μῆδὲ ὁπώραν. Vines and fig-trees, not to mention others, were well known in Egypt. Cf. 379A τοὺς ἀπὸ δένδρων (καρπύους).

380B. Should δείξαντα be διδάξαντα? Cf. Markland's correction 356B.

381F. We should expect τὸ κατ' ἰσότητα (or at any rate τὸ ἰσότητι) δίκαιον.

383A. εἰ δὲ <δεῖ> . . . εἰπεῖν.

H. RICHARDS.

"FAIRY GOLD"—AN ANCIENT BELIEF.

WE are familiar enough in modern fairy-tales and other traditions with the belief in fairy gold; gold, that is, or some other valuable thing, possessed by a supernatural being and given by him to a mortal, who finds after a time that it has changed to a worthless substance, generally ashes. I do not remember ever seeing this noted in any work on mythology as an ancient Greek belief, but the following considerations show, I think, that it was:

(1) Such a belief undoubtedly exists in modern Greece. Considering the many events which have occurred to interrupt the flow of tradition through the Middle Ages from classical times, I do not lay much stress on this; but still, as a considerable number of modern peasant beliefs have been, if not with certainty, at least with high probability traced to ancient ritual and custom, I give an example or two from a recent article in *Λαογραφία*, the organ of the Greek Anthropological Society. In Vol. IV. p. 22 we have the following—part of the directions for finding treasure given by an inhabitant of Sozopolis to an enquirer:

ὁ γαῖρὸ πὰ παγαίνης νὰ βγάλῃς

γρόσια, πρέπει νὰ μὴ χωρατέψῃς κανεῖν-
αννα. . . . "Ἄμα χωρατέψῃς, χάνεται
ὁ θησαυρός . . . σκάπτεις, καὶ κεῖ ποῦ
σκάπτεις βρίσκεις κάρβουνα. "Ἄμα
βγάλῃς τὰ γρόσια, ὅσο ποῦ νὰ πάῃς 'ς
τὸ σπίτι, δὲ γάνει νὰ γυρίσῃ πίσον νὰ
δγῆς. Μόνε γυρίσῃς καὶ δγῆς, θὰ κακο-
πάθῃς. καὶ κεῖ ποῦ βαστᾷς χρήματα,
γλέπεις κάρβουνα. I.e., if I do not
misunderstand his rather broad dialect,
"All the while you are going to get
treasure, you mustn't pass the time of
day with anyone. If you do, the trea-
sure goes . . . you dig, and on the spot
where you dig you find ashes. If you
get the money, while you're going home
you mustn't turn round to look back; if
once you do turn round to look, you'll
have ill luck and where you're carrying
the money you'll have ashes."

Again, this time from the province of Kyzikos (*ibid.* p. 28):

"Ἄμα δύνῃ κι' οὐνειρεντῇ κανεῖς φλουριά
'ς ἕνα μέρους, πρεπ' νὰ μὴ δοῦ πῇ κανε-
νοῦ—ἄμα μλῆς', τότες τὰ φλουριά γένει
κάρβυνα. 'If anyone happens to dream
that there are coins in a place, he mustn't
tell anyone about it; if he tells, then the
coins turn into ashes.'

It appears from the rest of the article

that these unfortunate results may be avoided by proper precautions, and that if the money is so changed it may be restored by censing it for forty days. More examples will be found in Lawson, *Modern Greek Folklore*, pp. 199, 281. In a note on the latter page Lawson quotes as an ancient parallel, the proverb *ἀνθρακες ὁ θησαυρός*, Lucian *Philops.* 32 (58), Zenobius II 1. Add Luc. *Hermotimus* 71 (813), Zeuxis 2 (840), *Naug.* 26 (265); Zenobius, *Diogenianus* I 90, and the *Bodleian paroemiographus* (129) merely quote Lucian. But the most important of the passages in which Lucian uses the saying is *Timon* 40 (153), in which the misanthrope actually discovers a buried treasure and is 'afraid he will find nothing but ashes when he wakes up.' These passages, and the line of *Phaedrus* which *Schottius* on *Zenob.* l. c. quotes (*V. vi. 6*), 'carbonem ut aiunt pro thesauro inuenimus,' carry the belief back to Imperial times. But that Greek, Roman, and Asiatic beliefs were then jumbled together in the utmost confusion is a common-place. We cannot be absolutely sure that Lucian did not fetch that proverb with him from his Asiatic home, or that *Phaedrus* had it from a Greek source. It is therefore worth while to seek further back.

(2) *Tibullus* certainly has an allusion to such a belief, I. ix. 11:

muneribus meus est captus puer. at deus illa
in cinerem et liquidas munera uertat aquas.

For although this is not a statement of fact but an imprecation, such things are good evidence. Does anyone ever, in blessing or in cursing, wish something to happen which he believes to be absolutely impossible? It may be a thing beyond ordinary human power to effect; but at least it is something which can be done by magical or divine means, and generally something which in fact or in common belief is sometimes done. The originators of the phrase 'Devil

take you' had a lively faith in Satanic intervention; the neo-Hellenic 'Fire in your mouth' and 'Garlic in your path' refer respectively to the appropriate punishment, here or hereafter, for the evil speaker, and to a popular method of warding off bogies. The Homeric *ῥῥῶρ καὶ γαῖα γένοισθε* means, I take it, 'May you die and rot.'

(3) Greek influence is probable enough in *Tibullus*; it is even more so in the *Rudens* of *Plautus*, one of the most thoroughly Greek of all his dramas. In this play, 1256, *Gripus* says:

at ego deos quaeso ut quidquid in illo uidulost,
si aurum, si argentum est, omne id ut fiat cinis.

A passage which possibly *Tibullus* had in his mind. It is noticeable that the money is in this case a treasure-trove, a *ἐρμαιον*, like *Timon's* find, and so particularly susceptible, one would suppose, to the attacks of magic.

(4) While I have so far been unable to find any direct reference to this belief in any author of the best period of Greek literature, I think it may be alluded to in *Apollonios Rhodios*, IV. 1405 *sqq.* In this those fairy-like beings the *Hesperides* do not, indeed, turn their gifts to ashes but themselves take the form of dust on the approach of intruders. The context indicates, what the actual words of the passage just referred to do not directly state, that all the magic garden became dust as well until the potent prayer of *Orpheus* brought all back to its true form, as in modern Greece the incense does the treasure. See 1423 *sqq.*, where the bare ground, it would seem, produces grass and then trees from which the nymphs appear; contrast 1401, in which at least the tree of the golden apples is visible.

In conclusion, I have to thank Dr. Rouse for drawing my attention to part of the material used in this note.

H. J. ROSE.

McGill University, Montreal, Canada.

AQUAI IN LUCRETIUS.

THE student of Lucretius who takes up any one of the four editions (Brieger, Bailey, Giussani, Merrill) which have appeared since Munro and turns to I. 453-4 will find this text :

pondus uti saxis, calor ignist, liquor aquai,
tactus corporibus cunctis, intactus inani.
(ignist . . . aquai *Bockemüller*: ignis
aquae MSS.)

Of these two lines the first will not scan and the second is not Latin. It is time, therefore, that something was said—or re-said.

The genitive of *aqua* was at one time *aquāi*. At no time was *aquāi* the dative of *aqua*. The dative of *aqua* was *aquāi*, the precise metrical equivalent of *aquae*. This admits of no doubt. The original Idg. datival suffix was -ai, a short diphthong. This suffix appears in Sanskrit *asvayai*,¹ in Lithuanian *rankai*,¹ in Gothic *gibai*,¹ in Greek *χώρα, τιμᾷ(-ῇ)*. It is the same suffix as meets us in the verbal *δόμεναι, ἴδμεναι*, in the adverbial *χαμαί*, in the preposition *παρὰ*. In the Italic languages it appears as -ai in Latin (dialectal or Old Latin, -e, -a), as -ai in Oscan, as -e in Umbrian. The dative *aquai* is analysable into a stem *aquā-* and a case-suffix -*āi*. These two elements coalesce into *aquāi* (with monophthongal final syllable). *aquāi* is, therefore, as false metrically as would be in Greek *νεανῖαι, χωρᾷ*, and little less false than *χαμαί, δόμενῖαι*.

Lachmann long ago rejected *aquāi*, dative, not on philological grounds, nor for metrical reasons, but simply because he had observed that no Latin poet ever employed a dative in -ai (Lachmann was well aware that Ennius, *Ann.* 489 was a delusion of the ancient grammarians—it is still a delusion of Buecheler and Brieger and Giussani: see *Neue-Wagener, Formenlehre*³, I, p. 25). But why does no Latin poet employ a dative in -ai? When we reflect on the constant employment by Ennius, Plautus and Lucretius—to say nothing of Vergil—of the genitive in -ai, it is not a little remarkable that there should be

nowhere any example of a dative in -ai. Of this remarkable circumstance there is only one explanation. It is a somewhat obvious one, yet I have never seen it given. No Latin poet ever employs the dative in -ai, for the simple reason that no Latin poet could ever have had any motive for so doing. The form in -ai being the precise metrical equivalent of that in -ae, the use of -ai would have been a mere *orthographical* archaism.

The only thing that could be said in support of *aquāi* in this passage is the only thing that never has been said by any editor of Lucretius: that is, that Lucretius twice offers *rēi* as the dative of *res* (I. 688; II. 236). On the analogy of *aquāi* we should expect *rēi*; and *rēi* is the form employed by Ennius, Plautus, Terence, Lucilius, and more than once attested by the *re (=rēi) publicae* of MSS. of Cicero: see *Neue-Wagener*³, I, pp. 575-6. But not only does Lucretius twice offer us *rēi*, but *rēi* (from *rēi*) is found as dative in Horace (*Odes*, III. 24, 64). The explanation seems to be that suggested by Brugmann, *K.V.G.* p. 384. *rēi*, as against *rēi*, represents an original *rēi-i* (Old Indian *rav-e*), a form parallel rather with *nau-i* than with *aquāi*. On the analogy of *rēi (=rēi-i)* were formed in a later period *fidēi* (Manilius III. 107, Seneca, *Thy.* 764—*ib.* 520 *fidēi* is, I think, genitive), *spēi* (Seneca, *Ph.* 131), *diēi* (Manilius V. 699).

aquāi, then, is only a genitive form.² Between this form and the later *aquae* we should expect to find a transition-form *aquā-i*. I believe that we can in Lucretius find such a form. We should be prepared for it on phonetic grounds, and we should expect it on the analogy of genitives of the fifth declension.

² I am not here concerned with line 454. But of *intactus* I will say thus much. Lachmann's rule needs a slight modification. It will be absolute if stated in this form: Verbal nouns with *n-* privative prefix are not found in Latin save in the ablative case or in an equivalent adverbial construction. Thus, we may say *iniussus senatus fiebat*, but not *iniussus senatus officiebat*: *ver incultum imminuebatur*, but not *incultus imminuebat*.

¹ Brugmann, *Grundriss*, ii. 2, 738.

The two declensions have a strictly parallel development; and this is much more clearly exhibited in their genitive forms than we commonly suppose. It is usual to speak as though the normal termination of the genitive case in the fifth declension was *-ēi*, and as though other forms—*-ēi*, *-ēi*, *-i*, *-e* were somewhat exceptional. This assumption squares, I fancy, very ill with such evidence as we possess. The oldest form of the genitive termination in the fifth declension was *-es*, just as in the first it was *-as*. This was superseded in the fifth declension by *-ēi*, in the first by *-āi*—the *-i* suffix being borrowed perhaps from the genitive of the second declension. In the first we readily recognise *-āi* as an archaism. We are most familiar with it from Lucretius, in whom I have counted 132 examples (Ennius offers 7, Lucilius 3 (?), Plautus perhaps 25, Cicero 5, Vergil 4). Genitives in *-ēi* from the fifth declension are similarly to be regarded, I fancy, as examples of archaism, and as nothing more. It is only from the poets, of course, that we can determine the metrical value of the syllables: *-ei* in the prose-writers may quite well be monosyllabic. If we turn to the poets we shall find at once that just as Lucretius is our principal witness to the genitive in *-āi*, so he is to the parallel form in *-ēi*. He employs it no less than fourteen times (*diēi*, eleven times; *rēi*. II. 112, 548; *fidēi*, V. 102). But outside Lucretius where do we find it? We have one instance (*fidēi*) from Ennius, *Ann.* 389; we have *rēi* twice in Plautus (*Mil.* 103, *Most.* 88), *fidēi* once (*Aul.* 121), and *diēi* perhaps thrice, but I have not the references. Terence has *diēi* once (*H.T.* 168): so once Vergil *A.* IX. 156, once Horace *S.* 1. 9. 35 (both these last references are given falsely in L. and S., and the same false references appear in Mr. Roby's Grammar), once Phaedrus, ii. 8, 10. These lists are, perhaps, not exhaustive, but outside them we shall search some time, I fancy, in a reputable poet¹ for instances of the genitive in *-ēi*. (An exception must be made in the case of technical astronomical poets, who can hardly avoid *diēi*.)

¹ *diēi* is found in the *Vir Bonus* (15) and in the *Est et Non* (20).

Manilius has it four times, and, in his astronomical eclogues, Ausonius twice.)

-ēi, then, is an archaism. It early gave way before a monophthongal form, *-ēi*, *-i*, or *-e*—which may be regarded as the normal form. This monophthongal form may be traced even in the prose-writers. We find, for example, in the MSS. of Cicero *republicae*, in Livy *spe, perniciē*—all genitives: see Neue-Wagener, *loc. cit.* The transition from *-cī* to *-ēi*, *-i* is furnished by eight examples of *rēi* (four from Plautus, four from Terence), and by six examples of *fidēi* (two from Manilius, four from Silius); cf. also Seneca, *Thy.* 520. The form in *-ēi* is, therefore, extremely rare. Of the corresponding *-āi* form in the first declension no example has hitherto been adduced. Yet three passages of the sixth book of Lucretius, taken in conjunction with one another, seem to me to afford some evidence of the existence of such a form. At 552 the MSS. offer

in magnas aquae uastasque lacunas,

where editors postulate (Munro, indeed, very doubtfully) *āq-ū-ae*: but for such a scansion they can find, outside Lucretius, neither authority nor analogy. The form *āq-ū-āe* is, in fact, so incredible that at 868

quae calidum faciunt aquae tactum atque saporem,

all our MSS. have, by a patent interpolation, substituted the synonym *latitans*: and but for a single honest grammarian who quotes the line we should never have known the truth. In both these passages I think it possible that we should restore *āquā-i*. At 1072-3

uitigeni latices aquai fontibus audent misceri

(in aquai *Marullus*: but, as Lachmann observes, we need, not *in*, but *cum*) the true remedy may, similarly, be

uitigeni latices āquāi < cum > fontibus audent.

These three isolated genitives in *-āi* need not surprise us when we remember (a) that it is to Lucretius that we owe three-fourths of the *-ai* genitives that have been preserved to us, and (b) that of the *-ēi* genitives we have but eight isolated examples from the Republican

period, and but seven from later writers. Take the Latin of the Republic. Take away Plautus and Terence, and you will find, outside Lucretius, only nineteen -āi genitives, and no -ēi genitives at all. It would not be wonderful, then, if outside Lucretius, we found no example of an -ā-i genitive. Yet it seems likely that there is, outside Lucretius, at any rate a solitary example of such a genitive. At Plautus, *Mil. Gl.* 552, the MS. variants seem to point to

aqua āquāi sumi quam haec est atque ista hospita,

and this is read by Lindsay.

On the subject of the *dative* of the fifth declension, I am indebted to Professor Lindsay's paper in the *Classical Review*, X., pp. 424-7. Most of the references which I have given are to be found—naturally—in *Neue-Wagener*. I have added, however, a certain number of my own, though I can hardly hope that my lists are complete. But they are, I think, sufficiently complete to indicate that our grammars need some revision.

H. W. GARROD.

Merton College, Oxford.

NOTES

ON THE DERIVATION OF THE WORD ΠΟΛΕΜΟΣ.

THE name Τριπόλεμος, in spite of its meaning, the 'Thrice-plougher,' must be regarded, as P. Kretschmer regards it in *K. Z.* 31, p. 426, as a compound of the word πόλεμος, πτόλεμος, 'war.' But, so far as I am aware, the exact relationship between the two words has never been clearly established, because the origin of the word πόλεμος has been sought in the wrong direction. Prellwitz, in his *Worterbuch*, and Persson, *Wzerweit.* p. 68, both connect it with πάλλω and the Latin *pello*; Vaniček, p. 513, and Wharton, *Etyma Graeca*, with the Zend root *par* 'fight'; and these suggestions do not help towards the meaning 'plough.'

But if we may put aside for a moment the meaning of the word, the origin of πόλεμος is obvious; it is a regular noun-formation from the I.E. root q^uel, 'go, move, frequent,' seen in the Sanskrit *car*, the Latin *colo*, and the Greek τέλλω, πέλω; just as from the I.E. root el comes οἶμος, 'going, path,' and from I.E. g^uem comes βωμός, 'stepping, step, altar-step.' Exactly parallel with πόλεμος, 'going, traversing,' is πέλεθρον, 'space traversed, field.'

From this original and neutral meaning of 'traversing' differentiation is easy;

the meaning of the word varied according to the nature of the ground traversed: if it was your own, it meant 'cultivation, ploughing'; if it was your neighbour's, it meant 'inroad, foray'; and so we arrive without difficulty, on the one hand, at Τριπόλεμος, 'the Thrice-plougher,' and at Νεοπτόλεμος, 'the Young Raider,' on the other.

If this derivation of πόλεμος be accepted—and it is so transparently simple that I marvel that I have never yet seen it in print—it may throw some light on the puzzle of the πτ- doublet form. This peculiarity is shared by only one other Greek word, πόλις, as to whose origin authorities are not agreed. Some, including Fick, refer it to the root q^uel mentioned above, quoting the Latin *incola* to illustrate the shade of meaning; while others equate it with the Sanskrit *purī* and derive it ultimately from the root plē, 'fill.' Against the latter view it may be urged that if the initial consonant of πόλις comes from an I.E. p, no reason can be suggested why it should ever have become πτ-; for the old theory of the 'parasitic j' can scarcely be defended after Kretschmer's criticism of it in the article quoted above.

If, on the other hand, we may connect πόλις with πέλω and πολέω—and the suggestion presented no difficulty to

Aristophanes—the reason for the $\pi\tau$ may be sought in the change of the velar guttural.

When in early Greek the pronunciation of the velar guttural shifted, the resulting sound was either a labial or a dental, the choice between the two being determined by the nature of the following sounds. This determining influence, however, was not so strong but it could be overborne by analogy; so that we find, for example, $\pi\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\omega$ as well as the theoretically correct $\tau\acute{\epsilon}\lambda\lambda\omega$. Moreover, the initial combination $\pi\tau$ was common in Greek, arising sometimes from $\pi\iota$, as in $\pi\tau\upsilon\chi\acute{\eta}$, sometimes from the weakening of a root, as in $\pi\tau\acute{\epsilon}\rho\omicron\nu$ from the root pet , 'fly.' In cases, then, where either labial or dental might occur, I would suggest that in certain circumstances—the evidence is too scanty to decide what they were; possibly a vowel had to precede—both were pronounced together. The doublets thus produced may have existed only in one particular dialect-area, and the heavier forms were later supplanted entirely by the lighter, except that in the case of two common words the heavier form was preserved for metrical convenience in the Epics, and fortified by the literary usage, persisted locally in the spoken language as well.

W. F. WITTON.

St. Olave's Grammar School.

ΑΣΤΗΡ ΣΕΙΠΙΟΣ IN EUR. I. A. 6-7.¹

PHILOLOGIANS who lie snug in bed while Prof. Harry is squirrel-hunting may continue to indulge their sloth without any fear that he is stealing a march upon them either in the science of astronomy or in the art of interpretation. His description of dawn is a description of what never happened even in Kentucky, and shows that his attention was chiefly fixed, as it naturally would be, on the squirrels. When Aldebaran is on the meridian, $\mu\epsilon\sigma\sigma\acute{\eta}\rho\eta\varsigma$, it cannot be the last star to disappear in the light of day. So long as Alde-

baran is twinkling, Capella, a little to the north, will twinkle too, and so will the Dog-star; for although it is some way further east, and therefore more exposed to the extinguishing power of the daylight, its greater brilliancy preserves it longer from extinction. But Mr. Harry's astronomy interests me less than his exegesis. Agamemnon enquires $\tau\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \pi\omicron\tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\rho'\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\ \acute{\omicron}\delta\epsilon\ \pi\omicron\rho\theta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\epsilon\iota\ |\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\gamma\gamma\upsilon\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\eta}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\tau\alpha\pi\acute{\omicron}\rho\omicron\nu\ |\ \Pi\lambda\epsilon\acute{\iota}\alpha\delta\omicron\varsigma$; and Mr. Harry contends that 'the Pleiades are no longer visible.' Is it then the habit of squirrel-hunters to define the position of a visible object by its proximity to an object which is not visible? And, if so, do they catch many squirrels?

The $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ was neither Aldebaran (as Matthiae, snug in bed, suggested) nor any other of the fixed stars. Had it been, Agamemnon would not have asked his question. To know the fixed stars was part of a general's business, because they told him the points of the compass, the hour of the night, and the season of the year; and the appearance of a familiar luminary in its usual place would not provoke the most distracted commander to enquire its name. The $\acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$ of Euripides is, as Theon says, a planet: $\acute{\omicron}\ \tau\rho\alpha\gamma\iota\kappa\acute{\omicron}\varsigma\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\acute{\iota}\ \tau\iota\omicron\varsigma\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \pi\lambda\alpha\nu\eta\tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \tau\acute{\iota}\ \pi\omicron\tau'\ \acute{\alpha}\rho'\ \acute{\omicron}\ \acute{\alpha}\sigma\tau\acute{\eta}\rho\ \acute{\omicron}\delta\epsilon\ \pi\omicron\rho\theta\mu\acute{\epsilon}\upsilon\epsilon\iota\ \sigma\acute{\epsilon}\iota\rho\iota\omicron\varsigma$. Agamemnon lifts his eyes to the Pleiads and sees in their neighbourhood a star which he is not accustomed to see there; and hence his question.

A. E. HOUSMAN.

Trinity College, Cambridge.

ON TWO PASSAGES IN DEMOSTHENES' FOR PHORMIO.

§ 50. $\kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\nu\ \tau\acute{\iota}\mu\acute{\omicron}\delta\eta\mu\omicron\nu\ \kappa\alpha\acute{\iota}\ \tau\omicron\upsilon\varsigma\ \acute{\alpha}\lambda\lambda\omicron\nu\varsigma\ \tau\rho\alpha\pi\epsilon\acute{\zeta}\iota\tau\alpha\varsigma,\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\ \acute{\epsilon}\pi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\delta\eta\ \delta\iota\alpha\lambda\acute{\upsilon}\epsilon\iota\nu\ \acute{\epsilon}\delta\acute{\epsilon}\eta\sigma\epsilon\nu\ \omicron\acute{\iota}\varsigma\ \acute{\omega}\phi\epsilon\acute{\iota}\lambda\omicron\nu,\ \acute{\epsilon}\acute{\xi}\acute{\epsilon}\sigma\tau\eta\sigma\alpha\nu\ \acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu\ \tau\acute{\omega}\nu\ \acute{\omicron}\nu\tau\omega\nu$.

Thalheim, Beauchet, and Lipsius, in their respective works on Attic law, cite the above passage as it stands, and without comment. Hence it is with some hesitation that I suggest that the word $\acute{\alpha}\pi\acute{\alpha}\nu\tau\omega\nu$ is corrupt: it can hardly

¹ See *Classical Review*, pp. 190-1

be defended by any supposed reference to ἀγρόν in the preceding sentence, as Aristolochus' bit of land was evidently all that Aristolochus had. The phrase ἐκστῆναι τῶν ὄντων is technical, and we never find, nor should we expect to find, ἀπάντων with it. Cf. XXXIII. 25, XXXVII. 49, XLV. 64, *Antiphon* II. β. 9, Aristophanes, *Acharnians* 615. It seems probable that an original ἅπαντες has been corrupted by grammatical assimilation to τῶν ὄντων. This gives a good antithesis to the following σὺ δ' οὐδὲν οἶε δεῖν σκοπεῖν, and is supported by § 51 οἱ μὲν γὰρ ἄλλοι τραπεζῖται μίσθωσιν οὐ φέροντες, ἀλλ' αὐτοὶ αὐτοῖς ἐργαζόμενοι, πάντες ἀπώλοντο, οὗτος δὲ κ.τ.λ. Cf. XLV. 46 ἐπειδὴ δ' ἀπώλετ' ἐκείνος καὶ τῶν ὄντων ἐξέστη.

§ 47. . . . ἄγεις εἰς μέσον, δεικνύεις, ἐλέγχεις, μόνον οὐκ ὀνειδίζεις οἶον ὄντα σ' ἐποίησαντ' Ἀθηναῖοι.

In *Hermes* XIII. Zurborg proposed to read Ἀθηναῖον (the more felicitous of two suggestions). Editors ignore the proposal, on the ground, I suppose, that ποιεῖσθαι does not actually require an accusative. May I point out that Ἀθηναῖον is the actual reading not only of Ambrosianus D (teste May), but of the Parisian? Cf. *Demos.* LIX. 89, *Lysias* XIII. 70 φήσκει αὐτὸν Ἀθηναῖον τὸν δῆμον ποιήσασθαι.

W. RENNIE.

The University, Glasgow.

CALPURNIUS AND VALERIUS FLACCUS.

Calpurnius, *Idyll* v. 60-61.

MSS. read :

verum ubi declini iam nona tepescere sole
incipiet, serique videbitur hora premendi. . .

In the second line 'sēri' gives correct sense, 'time for pressing out the whey,' but is unmetrical. The by-form 'seru,' quoted by Charisius, suggests that we should write the dative, 'seruique videbitur hora premendo.' 'Serui,' it seems, was not understood, and altered to 'sēri' 'late,' a word suggested by the mention of the ninth hour and 'declinis

sol.' 'Premendo' was then altered to 'premeni' to agree with 'seri.'

Valerius Flaccus v. 565.

MSS. read :

qualis ab Oceano nitidum corus aethera vestit.

The line is a simile for the brightness of armour, and the words 'ab Oceano' suggest that the corrupt 'corus' conceals a reference to the dawn. A suitable sense would be given by 'crocus' 'saffron,' which is used of the colour in Verg. *Aen.* 9. 614, Lucret. 6. 1188.

R. J. SHACKLE.

Marlborough, Wilts.

DRYDEN AND STATIUS.

DR. VERRALL, in his lecture on Dryden's *Quatrain Poems* (*Lectures on Dryden*, p. 98), refers to the poet's acknowledgment of the debt which some lines in the 98th stanza of the *Annus Mirabilis* owe to ll. 5 and 6 of Statius' famous *silva* on sleep :

nec trucibus fluuiis idem sonus, occidit horror
aequoris, et terris maria acclinata quiescunt.

It is perhaps worth while to point out that there is other evidence to shew that Dryden felt himself attracted by this particular piece. In the *Conquest of Mexico* (iii. 2) 'the mountains seem to nod their drowsy head' is, as Regnier pointed out in his preface to his translation of Rapin, a translation of l. 4 :

et simulant fessos curuata cacumina somnos.

It is of course a mistranslation: *cacumina* means 'tree tops' here, as Professor Slater sees, though on p. 23, where he quotes Mr. Fyfe's verse rendering, he raises no objection to 'the rounded mountains feign to sleep.' In the *Rival Ladies* (i. 3) I have noted a couplet in which Dryden contaminates ll. 5 and 6 of the Statian poem with a half-line from the famous night description of Apollonius (3. 748) :

Dogs cease to bark : the waves more faintly
roar
And roll themselves asleep upon the shore.

On the same page Dr. Verrall thinks that 'his (Dryden's) recent reading of the Third Book of Lucan's *Pharsalia*, where the successive ships are said to drive the sea's surface forward and back with their oars (iii. 550 ff.) has obviously suggested the hyperbolic language of stanza 177:

So vast the navy now at anchor rides
That underneath it the press'd waters fail,
And with its weight it shoulders off the tides.

The resemblance between the two passages seems to me of the slightest.

Line 2 undoubtedly, l. 3 also in all probability, came from Statius' description of the fleet of Agamemnon (*Ach. i. 443 sqq.*):

feruent portus et operta carinis
stagna suasque hiemes *classis* promota suosque
attollit fluctus: ipsum iam puppibus aequor
deficit.

The phrase 'shoulders off the tides' seems to me finer than anything in the original.

WALTER C. SUMMERS.

Sheffield, September, 1914.

REVIEWS

A NEW DECIPHERMENT OF THE HITTITE HIEROGLYPHS.

A new Decipherment of the Hittite Hieroglyphs. By R. CAMPBELL THOMPSON, M.A., F.S.A. Reprinted from *Archaeologia*. Vol. lxiv.

THE Hittite hieroglyphs still seem to defy our efforts at decipherment. Apart from the early and ill-conceived attempt of Conder, who called them 'Altaic,' and considered that the language they expressed was Mongolian (for no particular reason, so far as one can see), the Hittite symbols have been 'deciphered' in accordance with three systems—that of Jensen, that of Sayce, and now that of Mr. Thompson. Dr. Jensen had his *parti pris*, like Conder: the Hittites had to be Aryans. German writers are always very Aryan in sentiment: they have racial prejudices which are unknown to the British scientific man, who cares nothing whether he himself or the people he is writing about are 'Aryans' or not. The Germans care about it very much. Mr. Thompson is rather Aryophil too: his trend is distinctly towards an Indo-European character for the language of the Hittite hieroglyphs. Professor Sayce would not, I think, claim the Hittites as Indo-Europeans. After all, it is much more probable that they belonged to the non-Aryan chain of peoples that probably extended from Italy (Etruscans), through Greece and Crete (Minoans),

and Western Asia Minor (Carians and Lycians), to the Caucasus, where Georgian and kindred tongues still maintain themselves. We know that there were Aryans in Western Asia at the time of the Hittite Empire; the Mitannians, the nearest eastern neighbours of the Hittites in North Mesopotamia, were, though probably not Aryans themselves, certainly ruled by an Aryan aristocracy, which bore the name *Arya* (*Harie*), and worshipped the gods Indra and Varuna and the Nasatya-twins. This was in the fifteenth century, B.C., and these Aryans were then as yet not differentiated into *H*-men and *S*-men, into Iranians and Hindus. We know, too, that chieftains of this Aryan stock had already filtered down southwards into Southern Palestine, where they seized lordships for themselves, and took a considerable part in the series of commotions and revolts against Egyptian authority that accompanied the attempt of the great Hittite king Shubbiluliuma to extend his empire southward at the expense of that of the mad pharaoh Akhenaten. And at the same time it would appear that the Israelites were entering Palestine from the south, adding their quatum to the general welter. So there were then Aryans even in Palestine, in Mesopotamia, and no doubt north of the Black Sea and in Greece north of the Isthmus. But we have no proof or

probability of any in Asia Minor till the Phrygians came in over the Hellespont from Thrace. King Dushratta of Mitanni was an Aryan, but his enemy Shubbiluliuma probably was not. At any rate neither his name nor many other Hittite names have any Indo-European appearance. Does such a name as Khilpsil look Aryan, even if the termination *-is* (Khilpsilis was the nominative) does? When we do find an Aryan-looking name, such as Javajasa, this is more probably to be assigned to a Mitannian Aryan chief in Hittite service than to a real Hittite. The genuinely Hittite names show curious resemblances in form to the certainly non-Aryan Etruscan. I have no space for further details, but the probabilities are against an Aryan character for Hittite. And one does not see that Mr. Thompson has brought forward any evidence to shake this opinion, which is not affected by the claim of some scholars (upon which Mr. Thompson rests his belief) that the Arzawa Hittite, written in cuneiform, is Aryan, or as Mr. Thompson calls it 'Indogermanic.' Why not 'Indoceltic' or 'Indoslavic'? The Celts and Slavs probably speak purer 'Aryan' than any Teutons, whether German, English, or Scandinavian.

As to Mr. Thompson's method of decipherment it is impossible to give a definite opinion. It is ingenious and seems plausible, till one is suddenly brought up by what looks very like a *non-sequitur*. Then one wonders if this

is simply due to one's own stupidity, but is not convinced. Mr. Thompson's translations are all so remarkably 'pat.' They seem to make most of the inscriptions refer to alliances, and to little else. The date assigned to them by their decipherer is later than that usually regarded as probable. He would refer those of Carchemish to no earlier period than the ninth and eighth centuries, and believes that they deal mostly with the relations between the Hittites, Syrians, and Assyrians in the time of the Assyrian Shalmaneser II. and the Syrian Benhadad, of Irkhulina of Hamath, and of Panammu of Sam'al, all of whom he finds mentioned in the inscriptions. We shall cordially congratulate Mr. Thompson if he proves to be right, and we hope he will. But of course his work has to be very carefully checked and examined before any other worker can give a confident opinion as to its validity or non-validity. A criticism by Professor Sayce would be very much to the point, and we hope it will be forthcoming. After a moderately careful examination a student of near eastern matters who has not specially studied Hittite can only say that Mr. Thompson's system is ingenious and may prove to be partly correct, but strikes one as being illogical here and there, and as producing results that are rather too 'pat.' Congratulations on the work and commendation of the labour involved in it go without saying.

H. R. HALL.

TEUBNER TEXTS.

Sexti Empirici Opera recensuit H. MUTSCHMANN. Vol. I. and II. Pp. xxviii + 210. Teubner, 1912. M. 3.60 and M. 9.

Procli Diadochi in Platonis Cratylum Commentaria edidit G. PASQUALI. Pp. xiii + 149. Teubner, 1908.

Procli Diadochi Lycii Institutio Physica edidit A. RITZENFELD. Pp. xvi + 78. Teubner, 1912. M. 1.80.

Diadochus De Perfectione Spirituali edidit J. E. WEIS-LIEBERSDORF. Pp. vi + 165. Teubner, 1912. M. 3.20.

THESE volumes are among the latest issues of the familiar paper-clad Teubner texts, all alike edited in a workmanlike way, and each indispensable to the student whose work touches the same ground.

The first volume of the Sextus Empiricus contains the three books *Πυρρωνέων Ὅποτυπώσεων*, for which up till now we have had to rely on the text of Bekker—a somewhat hasty production of the great scholar. In his *Praefatio* (28 pp.) Herr Mutschmann summarises the results of his investiga-

tions of the MS. authorities, which he had already published in detail in *Mus. Rhen.* LXIV. (1909) : he shows that the MSS. fall into three classes, of which the earliest (Monacensis) belongs to the end of the fourteenth century, while the Latin Translation (T) is probably to be ascribed to the age of William Moerbeke (thirteenth century). A specimen page of this Latin Translation is printed at the end of the Greek text. Since Bekker, scholars like L. Kayser, A. Nauck, F. Kern, and others have contributed to the emendation of the text of the *Hypotyposesis*; and the editor acknowledges his debt also to Chr. Jensen, G. Pasquali, H. Diels and others, for criticism and advice.

The second volume contains the text of *adv. mathematicos* (vii.-xi.), the earlier books of that collection being left over to a third volume. In a *Praefatio* of nineteen pages the editor deals with the sources of the text and with earlier editions. Besides the MSS. used for the first volume the chief authority for the text of these books is a thirteenth-century Laurentian codex, which M. Mutschmann 'Arthurum Kochalsky secutus ad Nebel hujus codicis optimi investigatoris honorem siglo N' ornat. Among the scholars whose names appear most frequently in the critical footnotes to the text are Kochalsky, L. Kayser, and V. Heintz. As the preface of the first volume is dated May, 1911, and that of this second volume February, 1914, it will be seen that the editor is making fairly quick progress; and, when completed, the work will be indispensable to all students of Sextus.

Proclus on the Cratylus is only a collection of excerpts, probably the

work of a pupil. The frequent use of a plural verb after a neuter plural is a peculiarity of style which marks the writer as distinct from the composer of the Proclus Commentaries on the *Republic* and *Timaeus*; and this peculiarity, as M. Pasquali points out, he shares with the Aristotelian commentator Ammonius, a disciple of Proclus. A brief account of the MSS., mainly of fifteenth and sixteenth centuries, on which the text is based, is given in the *Praefatio*. The well-known names of Crönert and Kroll appear frequently in the critical foot-notes to the text, and a number of their suggestions are adopted by the editor.

Editors and translators since the sixteenth century have conspired to neglect the *Institutio Physica*, which M. Ritzenfeld here presents to us in the complete form of text, translation, and commentary. The alternative title of the work is *De Motu*, and since it deals with Aristotle's views in his *Physics* VI. and VIII. and *De Caelo* I. it may be commended to the attention of Aristotelians. For the construction of his text the editor is specially indebted to the researches of Kalbfleisch, to whom the volume is dedicated.

The author of the treatise, in 100 chapters, *De Perfectione Spirituali* (περί γνώσεως πνευματικῆς) was a Bishop of Photike in Illyria in the fifth century. As an example of the ethical teaching of the Churchmen of the period it is a work of some interest. Since Migne (vol. lxxv.) gives only the Latin translation of Diadochus's work by Torres, the issue of this primary critical edition of the original Greek deserves notice.

R. G. B.

MANILI ASTRONOMICON. LIBER II.

Manili Astronomicon. Liber II. Edidit H. W. GARROD. 1 vol. Pp. 166 + c. Oxford University Press, 1911. 10s. 6d. net.

It is a matter for congratulation that Professor Robinson Ellis' interest in the astrological works of the early Empire has descended to at least two

scholars of this generation—Professor Housman and Mr. Garrod. There is much in classical literature for the understanding of which a competent acquaintance with ancient astrology is indispensable, and until we are agreed to slur over such passages and to read selections only from the ancient classics, it will remain necessary to cope, so far

as we can, with astronomical facts and astrological beliefs. Mr. Garrod has made a welcome and valuable contribution towards the revival of such knowledge amongst us. Besides giving us a text constructed on scientific lines, he has provided a translation, neither low and creeping nor crude and loose, whereby the reader can follow his author easily and with a conviction of certainty. Further, a copious commentary of some ninety pages discusses such points as a curious student might wish to have elucidated. The mass of matter dealt with in the volume precludes any possibility of touching upon any substantial portion of it, and it will be perhaps of most service here thoroughly to sift the interpretation put by the editor upon a well-known passage, from the six pages of comment on which a page has been selected for circulation as a specimen page of the work. Says Manilius (l. 507-9):

Contra Capricornus in ipsum
Convertit visus—quid enim mirabitur ille
Maius, in Augusti felix cum fulserit ortum?

Yet not only Suetonius (*Aug.* 5) but Augustus himself (*ap.* Gellius xv. 7. 9) attests that the Emperor was born on a.d. IX. Kal. Octobr. This Breiter made 23 September—whereon Mr. Garrod waxes somewhat supercilious. But he has not observed that Breiter's figure is not the offspring of 'errors incidental to human frailty,' because 'nothing in the world is much harder than simple arithmetic.' The truth is that Breiter, like Professor Ginzl (*Hand. d. math. u. tech. Chronologie*, vol. 2, p. 271, where other references to modern authorities are to be found), believes that the dating is Julian, *i.e.* that till 45 B.C. Augustus' birthday was written a.d. VIII. and afterwards as a.d. IX. (Perhaps Ovid's date for the battle of Mutina is to be reconciled on similar lines with that found in the well-known letter to Cicero.) This apology for Breiter, however, is incidental to our enquiry. The vital issue is, how and why is it that Capricorn was the sign 'that shone happily on the rising of Augustus'? Our editor, with Professor Housman, is absolute that the sign horoscoping is the sign under

which a man is born, according to the ancient astrologers. Other modern writers suppose that sign to be the one in which the sun stands at the man's birth. Both views, of course, make Manilius inexplicable.

Mr. Garrod seeks an escape by wild manipulation of the Calendar, of which more will be said in a moment. The true solution has escaped him, and his invocation of Dr. J. K. Fotheringham's help at this point suggests a doubt as to his own acquaintance with what is a necessary equipment for grappling with such problems. Till 1904 there was some excuse for the editor of a Latin classic who hesitated to attempt the casting of an ancient horoscope; but in that year Dr. P. V. Neugebauer published *Tables for the Sun and Great Planets*, and in 1905 for the Moon (Berlin: Ferd. Dümmler: Veröff. d. Kön. Astron. Rechen-Inst. zu Berlin). Before throwing over the straightforward interpretation of the passage, we must have before us the positions of these luminaries at the moment of birth stated for us by our authorities. But it will be well first to quote some lines from Manetho:

σάφα νῦν καταλέξω
ὀππόθεν ἐν γενέθλῃσι χρεῶν ζωῆς χρόνου
ἀρχὴν
ἀνθρώποις φράζεσθ' ἢ δ' ἔμπαλιν, ὀππόθι
λήγει.
οὐ μὲν δὴ πάντεσσιν ὁμῶς μερόπεσιν
ἔοικεν
οἷης ἐκ χώρας ἐτέων λάζυσθαι ἀριθμόν·
ἄλλῃ γάρ θ' ἐτέρῃ γενέθλῃ ἄφεσις συνά-
ρῃεν.
ὅσσοις μὲν Τιτὰν ἡοὶ ἐν γεινομένοισιν
κέντρῳ ἐπεμβεβαὼς ἰνδάλλεται, ἐξ ἄρα
κείνου
μοίρης ἄρχεσθαι βίотου χρόνον ἐξαριθ-
μοῦντας·
νυκτερινῇ γενέθλῃ δὲ Σεληναίης ἀπὸ
μοίρης.
ὀππότε δ' ἂν κέντρων ἐκτὸς δύο φῶτ'
ἀποκλινηθῇ,
ἢ δ' ἄρ' ἐπὶ μοίρῃσι κατωφερέεσσι πόλοιο
νίσσεται προθέοντα, τότε ἄστερος ἄρχει
κείνου
ὅς ῥά τε δεσπόζει γενέθλης μέγα τε κράτος
ἴσχει.
εἰ δ' ἄρα καὶ κείνῳ λεύσσοις κλινθέντ'
ἀπὸ κέντρου,
ἐξ ὥρης τότε ἔπειτα χρόνων ἄφεσιν σύ γε
φράζου.

The determination of the ruling star and sign then is not so simple as editors have supposed. The facts of Augustus' birth may now be stated. We are told by Suetonius that he was born *paullo ante solis exortum*, and about 22 September (Julian) the sun rises at Rome about a quarter to six. We may suppose the birth then to be at 5.30 a.m. or a little earlier. Since the Julian calendar was not then in force, we have, as the Julian equivalent of 22 Sept. (if our authorities' dating is not Julian), either 20 September according to Unger,¹ or 21 September according to Holzapfel and P. Groebe. It will be seen that this horoscope, while allowing either date, somewhat favours the latter. The star-positions are as follows for 5.30 a.m. at Rome in 63 B.C.:

Sept.	☉.	☽.	♄.	♃.
20.	174° 3'	262° 39'	30° 26'	103° 21'
21.	175° 3'	274° 31'	30° 23'	103° 31'
22.	176° 2'	286° 24'	30° 20'	103° 41'
	Libra.	♏ and ♍.	Taurus.	Cancer.

Sept.	♂.	♀.	♂.
20.		316° 18'	125° 59'
21.	33° 6'	317° 53'	130° 27'
22.		319° 28'	134° 54'
	Taurus.	Aquarius.	Leo.

where allowance is made for the ancient reckoning of the Signs from 7° earlier than they are reckoned to-day. If we allow for the latitude of Rome, we have approximately for the first degree of the various Houses in the Figure of the Heavens on the 21st:

*I. ♄ 22° with ☉ in it.	*VII. ♄ 22°.
II. ♃ 25°.	VIII. ♄ 25° with ♄ and ♂.
III. ♏ 4°.	IX. ♄ 4° with ♃.
*IV. ♍ 11° with ☽.	*X. ♄ 11°.
V. ♍ 10° with ♀.	XI. ♄ 10° with ♀.
VI. ♄ 4°.	XII. ♄ 4°.

* These houses are angles.

On the assumption that the Houses should be truly equidistant, this would be slightly altered, all the Houses beginning perhaps with 21° of their respective Signs.

When we ask what is the ruling star, since (as Shelburne saw) the birth is at night—the Sun being not risen—we

have first in rank to consider whether the Moon is in an angle. She is, and therefore she dominates the horoscope, and the ruling Sign is accordingly Capricorn. Geminus notes '*nocturnis originibus favent luna Mars Venus, plus die possunt sol Saturnus Iuppiter, Mercurius varie et quomodo consensit aut visus est*' (*Fragm.* iii. § 10). Theagenes would of course notice ♄ Δ ♀ and ♂, and ☉ Δ ♀ and ♃. (See too Manetho ii. 184 ff., 361 ff., 407 ff., iii. 106 ff. and iv. 35 ff.)

Without further comment on this horoscope, and the way the ancients would interpret it, we may record the star-positions for Horace's birth, the date of which we know to have been 8 Dec. 65 B.C., equivalent to a Julian date of 2 December. The Sun was at noon that day in 247° 12' (Sagittarius), the Moon in 54° 17' (the Roman Gemini), Saturn 357° 0' (the Roman Aries), Jupiter 32° 6' (Taurus), Mars 10° 6' (Aries), Venus 343° 52' (Pisces) and Mercury 276° 9' (Capricorn). Since the Sun rose that day at Rome about 7.15, we may assign the birth to about 3 a.m. when, whichever² way the Houses be reckoned, we can have in the Ascendant Libra and part of Scorpio, and in the 4th House (an angle) and Lord of the Horoscope Mercury. Since Mars also is in an angle, and the birth is at night, Horace may have thought at first that Mars not Mercury was predominant. Thus are explained Horace's implication that he was a *vir Mercurialis* and his *seu Libra seu me Scorpions aspexit* . . . *seu Capricornus*.

It would be travelling too far outside the proper scope of this notice to show how it is possible to go further and to determine the year of Maecenas' birth: this must be reserved for a short separate paper in the future. Here we must be content to add, as a last proof that Mr. Garrod is mistaken in rejecting the usual transvaluation of the Roman calendar-dates, the fact that he has to juggle with express statements of Dio Cassius. 'It is certain,' he says, 'that

¹ In an appendix to my edition of *Cicero: Select Letters* (Blackwood) I have given the same equivalent for this date.

² If latitude be allowed for, we may have, e.g., the Houses beginning I. with 165°, II. with 213°, III. with 248°, IV. with 273°, V. with 294°, and VI. with 316°.

(1) that year' (i.e. 41 B.C.) 'was what we call a "Leap Year"; (2) it ended with a market day.' As to the first statement I will merely refer to Unger in Müller, *Hand. d. class. Wiss.*, p. 818; as to the second, the year could only end with a market day if Dio Cassius, xlviii. 33 § 4, is correct, and then it follows that Mr. Garrod cannot give 365 days for 42 B.C. but 365 + 1 days. With this goes the inference that the year 46 contained 422 + 23 days, and then the total days from 52 to 41 are 4424 + 1, which is quite in harmony with our authorities. Not a shadow of doubt can remain that the whole of the editor's discussion of Augustus' horoscope and of the Roman calendar is misguided.

But it would be misleading to leave this as the last word. The book, as we

have already seen, is a thoroughly valuable piece of work, throwing such light as modern scholarship can dispense on a thorny and intricate subject, and as such it deserves a hearty welcome from all classical students.

T. NICKLIN.

As a pendant to this review, it may be permitted to mention two recent additions to the Teubner series, each deserving welcome and consideration, viz.:

Claudii Ptolemaei opera quae exstant omnia: vol. 2, opera astronomica minora, ed. J. L. HEIBERG (M. 9); and *Des Claudius Ptolemäus Handbuch der Astronomie*. Erster Band a. d. Griechischen übersetzt u. mit erklärenden Anmerkungen versehen, von KARL MANITIUS (M. 8 or M. 8.60).

THE CITY STATE IN ANCIENT ITALY.

The City State in Ancient Italy (Der Staat der alten Italiker). By DR. ARTHUR ROSENBERG. Berlin: Weidmannsche Buchhandlung. 1913. M. 4.

DR. ROSENBERG has made a lucid and interesting investigation of the forms of government which prevailed in pre-Roman times in the different Italian communities, and the essay deserves a hearty welcome. Though its title and size, like its style, are modest, it represents a substantial addition to our knowledge of ancient Italy and of the elements from which the Roman Republican Constitution was drawn; and it includes a very welcome sketch of the political institutions of Etruria. The author is familiar with the inscriptional record from all the districts, and his discussion of the Etruscan evidence is a welcome sign of the solid progress which has been made in recent years in the interpretation of that difficult language by the patient and able research of Herbig and Torp, and above all by the brilliant work of the late Professor Skutsch. As a pupil of Skutsch, Dr. Rosenberg has learnt to combine evidence of many different kinds and to treat that of tradition with respect instead of contempt—a lesson

which indeed the present generation of scholars has been taught again and again by the continual confirmation of ancient testimony by modern excavation. A striking example will be found in the chapter on the origin of the Roman lictors, where the evidence of Livy and other writers as to the Etruscan origin of the Roman fasces is strikingly confirmed by the find of a bundle of twelve hollow iron rods tied on to a double-headed axe in the tomb of some distinguished person¹ at the Etruscan town Vetulonia). The archaeologists assign the tomb to the sixth century B.C., and in any case it is entirely free from all trace of Roman influence. The confirmation of a particular passage in Silius Italicus, who ascribes to this particular town the origin of the fasces (*Pun.* viii. 483 ff.), is perhaps accidental but curiously exact.

The book begins by a discussion of the Aedileship, which must originally have been a religious office, as the name indicates, and which the author by a

¹ Surely not himself a 'lictor,' *pace* the Italian excavators, as Dr. Rosenberg has realized (p. 86 note).

careful and accurate study of the inscrip-tional evidence shows to have been borrowed from Tusculum, where we find the sacral character of the office surviving beside the political. Successive chapters collect what can be known of the offices of *meddix* and *censor* among the Samnites and Campanians, of the Sabine *octoviri* and of the Umbrian *marones*; and this leads naturally to the discussion of the Etruscan magistracies, where the same title *maro* re-appears, though no longer as that of the highest magistrate. By an admirable collection of the evidence from epitaphs from the chief Etruscan towns, the author traces the constitution of the Etruscan League which was re-organised by Augustus,¹ of course for religious purposes, and survived down to the time of Constantine and after (*C.I.L.* xi. 5265). At its head stood a magistrate, called in Etruscan *zilaθ rasuas*, and in Latin known as *praetor* (and sometimes *sacerdos*) *Etruriae*. The high dignity of this office appears from the fact that it was once held by the Emperor Hadrian. Beneath him was an officer known in Latin as *aedilis Etruriae* and in Etruscan as *marunuk*. Each of the twelve, or after Augustus fifteen, communities of which the League consisted had its own chief magistrate, whose title was *zilχ* or *zilax tenθas*, and the author is clearly right in taking these magistrates to be denoted by the *principes populorum* of Livy ix. 36. Beside each *zilχ* stood two lower officers called *marniu* and *purθne* (though the precise form of the words seems to vary in different places and dates). These two offices roughly correspond to those of *aedile* and *quaestor*. The offices were all annual and stood in a fixed order of precedence, and all but the headship of the League could be repeated several times. Space forbids me to dwell further on the details of this chapter which deserves most careful study.

Those which follow contain important deductions as to the growth of the Roman Constitution, especially the fact that the Dictatorship in Rome and other Latin towns was derived from the

Etruscan practice. Strangely enough, the author does not seem to be aware that two of the towns which he discussed at length, namely Praeneste and Tusculum, were especially under Etruscan influence (*Ital. Dial.* p. 310). Had he done so he would have treated with more respect the tradition appearing in two places in Livy (iii. 18; vi. 26) of a Dictator at Tusculum and also of the single Praetor of Praeneste (ix. 16),² and if he had studied a little more carefully Livy's statement (viii. 3) about the Latin *praetores* he would have seen that the adverb *tum* definitely implied that the Latin League had not always had two; so that the alleged discrepancy between Livy and the earlier writers simply does not exist. Is it not also a somewhat needless riddle to speak, as the author does twice, of the 'unknown statesmen who shaped the Roman Constitution'? Surely the tenour of the first half of the second book of Livy makes it clear that by the universal Roman belief it was the great Valerius Publicola; to call him 'unknown' is a trace of the Mommsenian dogmatic nescience, which the author shows elsewhere that he has happily outgrown. And why, one may ask, is the account given by Livy and Dionysius of the origin of the number 12 of the lictors 'of course (*natürlich*) worthless'? 'Of course' is a dangerous phrase and nearly always betokens some assumption which the writer is unable to justify.

There is little else to criticise in the book. One wonders why its Greek citations are printed throughout without any accents or smooth breathings, and with only a proportion of the rough breathings. Is it a piece of private negligence or a new fashion of the printers in Berlin? The interpretation given (p. 21) of the Oscan *proffed* is old-fashioned and certainly wrong, though it is happily irrelevant to the argument, and that of Oscan *verehias* (p. 99), though attractive from the point of view of the writer's argument, and impossible at present to disprove, has no basis yet in etymology.

¹ Bormann, *Arch.-Epig. Mitteil. aus Öst.*, xi. 103.

² This anecdote, it should be noted, is not attached by Livy to any particular year, but only given along with several others, in his picture of the personality of Papirius.

On the other hand, recognition is due to the wisdom of the note on the use of etymological evidence in general (p. 125) and to the careful and convincing analysis of *Aen.* x. 201-3, Vergil's description of the ethnology of Mantua, with the brilliant explanation at last given of Servius' difficult note on that passage. Another not less interesting and not less certain interpretation is that given (p. 133) to the well-known and difficult Dictator-inscription of Caere (*C. I. L.* xi. 3593). Here a point of confirmatory evidence has been overlooked. The inscription runs, or originally ran: *deos Curiales genium Ti. Claudii Caisaris Augusti p.p. curiae Aserniae A. Auillius Acanthus dictator sua impensa*

posuit. Here Mommsen wanted to take *curiae* as meaning a particular building, to which there are fatal objections. Dr. Rosenberg's view that it is Genitive after *deos Curiales* to which the 'genius of Tiberius' is added will remind the English reader at once of Horace's phrase (*Odes* iv. 5. 34) *et Laribus tuum miscet nomen*, which seems to clinch the argument.

Enough has been said to show that Dr. Rosenberg's book deserves a cordial and respectful welcome both for its own sake and as a promise of not less admirable work in the future.

R. S. CONWAY.

Manchester, September, 1914.

ROMAN IMPERIALISM.

Roman Imperialism. By PROFESSOR TENNEY FRANK. I vol. 8vo. Pp. xiii + 365. New York: The Macmillan Co. 10s. 6d. net.

PROFESSOR TENNEY FRANK has undertaken to give a complete account of Rome's international relations. This involves something like a complete history of Rome, and it is not surprising that his book is of some length, though a certain conciseness and economy, both in narrative and in discussion, is one of its excellences. No great space is given to the theory of international law, that subject having recently been treated in Coleman Philipson's *International Law and Custom in Greece and Rome*. Professor Frank's object is rather to do for three or four hundred years what Colin did for fifty in *Rome et la Grèce de 200 à 146 a. J. C.*, to trace the historical progress of Roman acts and feelings towards the outside world. The author has imagination, and his learning is more than accurate and complete—it is judicious and sensible. The chapters on the Latin League and on Julius Caesar are especially able in their reinterpretation of well-known data by a fresh mind.

The most detailed part of the book is on the second century B.C., the time of Rome's greatest expansion. Professor

Frank maintains steadily, and, we must admit, at all times sanely, that Rome never desired territorial expansion overseas; thus he stands for the plea of the Romans themselves, who insisted that what they did had always been forced on them. His discussion on the questionable League with the Mamertines, on the one hand, and of the quixotic withdrawal of garrisons from the 'three fetters' of Greece, on the other, are good examples of his method; but in the first instance, he passes far too lightly over the Polybian uneasiness at an alliance with a community of mutineers, even if of five-and-twenty years' standing. He also fails to make the distinction between the wisdom and the right of interference; it is arguable that it was judicious of Rome to interfere in Messana, her legal justification is another matter; for, in spite of what Professor Frank says about the nearness of Messana to Italy, he himself rightly lays down the principle that at this time Roman boundaries were absolutely definite, and the doctrine of 'spheres of influence' unknown to them (p. 124). Continuing, Professor Frank finds in the Scipionic circle anti-imperial feeling, and in the chapter on *Commercialism and Expansion* he enlarges the not inconsiderable amount of evidence which he produced in his paper in

the *American Historical Review*, vol. xviii., to combat the received view that Roman politics felt the pressure of the *negotiatores* as early as the second century B.C. A great deal of quiet, original work is embodied in these chapters. The chapter on Augustus and the Empire is far too slight, but is obviously only intended as a sketch.

To sum up, this book is extremely profitable, but it omits to give weight to one factor—the sheer profit to be made out of certain kinds of war in ancient times by certain sections of people. The settled farmer on a *small* farm would not be anxious to tax himself to pay a war-loan, or to walk from voting-booth to recruiting-station: so Professor Frank himself (p. viii.). But what of two other classes—the dispossessed, who had only his labour to sell, which he could dispose of more profitably to the general than to the employer of labour, and those who had so much land that they never put hand to plough themselves, but acted as overlords—the nobles? That the Roman nobles found overseas expeditions profitable and interesting seems to me beyond the pale of doubt; their well-managed estates, not in the least depending on their personal labour, could for a time be run by proxy. In spite of Professor Frank's able sketch of the nervous panic caused everywhere by the doings of Philip V., the opening of the second Macedonian War must still be put down to the greed of some of the Romans. Then, as in the next two wars, the two classes mentioned above combined, for (as Professor Frank omits to mention)

the Roman officers engineering the war were only allowed to take out volunteers (Liv. xxxi. 8). Moreover, the passage quoted by Professor Frank himself from Polyb. i. 11, which describes how the military commanders suggested to the people that they would *individually* get important material benefits from the war, would show that even as early as 264 B.C. such selfish considerations of profit had their weight. Finally, in 200 B.C., so averse were the bulk of the people to this unnecessary conflict, that the formal consent which was at last wrung out of them was only obtained with the help of some religious, i.e. aristocratic, machinery. Warde Fowler (*Religious Experience*, p. 836-7) has drawn attention to this, and if any historical value is attached to the words he quotes from the answer of the *haruspices* (Liv. xxxi. 5) *prolationem finium*, a section, at least, of the Roman people must already have looked forward to an extension of territory in Macedonia on the traditional Roman principle.

The notes of this book open up in small compass the most useful discussions and supply well-chosen references to important modern work. The selection of ancient passages quoted in the text is both wide and judicious; I have only noticed the omission of the wonderful eulogy of Rome in 1 Maccabees, ch. 8. The Ciceronian point of view, especially as shown in some passages in *de Officiis*, might have repaid some handling.

L. E. MATTHAEI.

Newnham College, Cambridge.

SCHOOL BOOKS.

(1) *Prima Legenda*, by J. Whyte (Cambridge University Press, 1s. 4d.).

(2) Simplified Texts: *Tales of Great Generals* (from Nepos); *Selections from Cicero*; *Anecdotes from Pliny's Letters*, ed. by W. D. Lowe (Clarendon Press, 1s. 6d. each); *Sallust's Catiline*; *The Agricola of Tacitus* (both much abridged), ed. by S. E. Winbolt (Bell, 1s. 6d. each).

(3) *Briefe des jüngeren Plinius* (63 selected letters), ed. by M. Schuster. Vol. I.: Text, etc., M. 1.50; Vol. II.: Kommentar, M. 1.20 (Tempsky, Vienna).

(4) *Livy: The Revolt and Fall of Capua*, ed. by T. C. Weatherhead (Cambridge University Press, 2s.).

(5) *Selections from Ovid*, Pt. II., ed. by A. C. B. Brown (Clarendon Press, 1s. 6d.).

(6) Euripides: *Iphigenia in Tauris* (abridged), ed. by T. S. Morton (Bell, rs. 6d.).

(1) In *Prima Legenda* (64 pp.) we have stories (as a foundation for oral lessons), English sentences to be translated, a little grammar. It does not carry the beginner far, but it is well planned and carefully worked out.

(2) We are rather alarmed to see how large a number of simplified texts is being produced. It looks as though many teachers were using them with pupils who ought to be reading real Latin. There is, it is true, a need for easy and interesting reading for an early stage, but the books named above seem to us too difficult to supply what is wanted. We have even a simplified Tacitus, and Mr. Winbolt advertises a 'first list of volumes,' as though he were going to make mincemeat of all the Classics. Yet a class which can deal with the large vocabulary and other difficulties of these books is quite capable of taking stronger and more nutritious food. It might have to begin a little more slowly and need a little more help, but it would be more likely to feel that the stuff was worth assimilating.

There is a great difference between Mr. Lowe's books and Mr. Winbolt's. Mr. Lowe's are overloaded with notes. The person for whom he writes seems to have no teacher and very little intelligence, but an extraordinary passion for long words. He has to have the easiest case constructions (such as puzzle no ordinary boy) explained again and again, and yet he can understand such hard sayings as '[Pliny] is a Ciceroniaster rather than a Ciceronian,' and 'the prolative or complementary infinitive completes the sense of so-called indeterminative verbs.' Mr. Winbolt understands his business much better and leaves more to the intelligence both of pupil and teacher. We wish we could induce him to give fewer and better pictures and to tell his readers a little about them. Boys can learn much from pictures, but they have to be taught what to look for in them. It is

a mistake to use Trajan's Column to illustrate Sallust without a word of explanation. The fancy pictures seem to us often misleading; we would give only well-ascertained fact and leave it to the imagination to combine them. We should be glad to know what parts of the strange picture 'Cicero addressing the Senate' are based on evidence.

(3) The Austrian edition of Pliny is an excellent piece of work. Anyone who is interested in making Roman life intelligible to schoolboys will do well to study the illustrations and the Appendix on antiquities which are included in the Text volume. Still more valuable for this purpose is *Römische Kultur im Bilde*, edited by H. Lamer (Quelle und Meyer, Leipzig, M. 1.25). It contains 96 pages of illustrations, including many which are not in the usual reference books, and 64 pages of text.

(4) Mr. Weatherhead does not believe in simplifying Livy; 'if many of his difficulties vanish in a "cooked" edition, so also do the excellencies of his style.' His book consists of selections from Livy 23-26, and is intended for those who are beginning Livy. He has evidently enjoyed his work; both the Introduction and the Notes are lively and interesting, and give the sort of help that is needed at this stage. The print is excellent.

(5) Mr. Brown's Ovid is admirably printed. The notes are largely of the type: 'Ablative of the Instrument,' 'Abl. of Place Where.' Our feeling is that boys could find out most of these for themselves. The expression (which occurs several times) 'Final use of *ut* with Subjunctive to express a Purpose' seems unsatisfactory. Does not 'final' mean 'expressing a purpose'? If we want boys to think clearly about grammar, we must take pains to get our own notions clear.

(6) 'By the omission of the choruses and of all the harder passages,' Mr. Morton has reduced *Iph. Taur.* to 628 lines. He writes good simple notes which show that he understands the needs of beginners.

SHORT NOTICES

Exempla Codicum Graecorum, litteris minusculis scriptorum annorumque notis instructorum. Volumen prius: Codices Mosquenses, ediderunt Gregorius Cereteli et Sergius Sobolevski. Mosquae, Sumptibus Instituti Archaeologici Mosquensis MDCCCXI. (Leipzig: Otto Harrassowitz.) Pp. xv + 43 plates in portfolio 17" x 21". Price M. 40. Volumen alterum: Codices Petropolitani. Mosquae, Sumptibus Ministerii Eruditionis Populi MDCCCXIII. Pp. xix + 62 plates (some double sheets). Price M. 50.

IN issuing this sumptuous series of photographic reproductions of specimen pages from manuscripts preserved in Russian libraries, the editors, so it appears from the preface to the first volume, have been actuated by a double motive. In the first place they wished to help the student by providing accurately dated specimens to illustrate the development of Greek minuscule handwriting, and secondly to draw the attention of scholars to the neglected manuscript treasures of St. Petersburg and Moscow. In the case of a poor student the price is likely to prevent the fulfilment of the first purpose, especially when excellent collections like Cavalieri and Lietzmann's *Specimina Codicum Graecorum* can be purchased for a few shillings. However, the cheaper books cannot challenge comparison with a series like the present, which provides a complete history of minuscule writing from the ninth to the fourteenth century, in a number of full-sized photographs of excellent workmanship, each on its separate sheet. In every instance the date is known accurately.

Two classes of scholars will take an interest in the Greek manuscripts of Russia, palaeographers and editors of texts. The former will study with eagerness the various types of handwriting, for the most part beautifully clear, and not infrequently embellished with miniatures. The latter will be more interested to know what authors are represented in the libraries of the two great Russian cities.

The manuscripts in the Moscow volume are as follows: St. Basil and St. Chrysostom five each, St. John Climacus four, Gregory Nazianzen and Evangelistria three each, Palladius and the Gospels two each, while the remainder is made up by Lives of the Saints and miscellaneous Service and other church books. The composition of the St. Petersburg volume is very similar, but it contains more biblical manuscripts. It appears, then, that these documents fall into three classes: (i.) Biblical, (ii.) texts of the Greek Fathers from Basil downwards, and (iii.) Greek church books. With a few exceptions the minuscules contribute little to the textual criticism of the New Testament. However, the contents of many of them are still unknown and interesting discoveries may await the explorer. Few of the Fathers of the fourth and following centuries have been critically edited as yet; those who undertake the task will clearly have to visit Russia in the course of their labours, or else arrange for accurate collations by Russian scholars. Eastern church books are almost beyond the horizon of Western scholars, and the task of editing them will naturally fall to the lot of Russian *savants*.

In the preface to the second volume the editors announce their intention of issuing a third volume, to be devoted to minuscules, drawn from both cities, of the fifteenth to the seventeenth centuries. We congratulate the editors on the successful accomplishment of the first part of their task, and the Russian Government on the manner in which it has shown itself a benefactor of learning.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Cavendish, Suffolk.

Some Leisure Hours of a Long Life. By H. MONTAGUE BUTLER, D.D., Master of Trinity College, Cambridge. Cambridge: Bowes and Bowes.

ALL lovers of good scholarship will welcome the appearance of the Master of Trinity's Latin and Greek verses in a

collected form: many are already familiar with them individually. They cover a period of some sixty years: there cannot be many scholars who have prolonged so far (still fewer, who have maintained at such a high level of excellence) the delightful and especially English art of Latin and Greek vers-making. But 'age does not wither' the Master, nor 'custom stale the infinite variety' of his metrical achievement.

These versions, like everything from the same hand, are models of form and taste. They are quite simple, for the most part, in diction: there are no efforts after the unusual or difficult or far-fetched. Nor, except once, does this volume contain any noticeable tours de force, in the way of attempting to translate what is really untranslatable. The one exception, and it is a large one, is of course that collection with which many of us have long been familiar—the series of versions of *Crossing the Bar*. It is really marvellous, the ingenuity with which the same thing has been said in so many different metres (one recalls Cicero's compliment to the versatility of Archias), and, still more, the delicate sense which somehow achieves the manner of expression with which each metre is associated. But, after all, Dr. Butler himself would be the first to acknowledge the impossibility of really reproducing the Tennysonian effect, depending as it does on the intimate union of sense with English sound. We boast ourselves to be better than our forefathers in the true understanding of the Greek and the Roman spirit: yet how alien our modern literary expression is from that of the Greeks and Romans, one sees by the undoubted fact that the poetry of the last half-century is really not translatable into Latin, nor even into Greek. Compare with the *Crossing the Bar* series the other and shorter series of versions of Herrick's 'What needs Complaints?' No thought in that rather unfeeling poem is foreign to Latin: and as one reads the Master's Horatian renderings, one seems to read Horace himself.

Dr. Butler is a perfect master of the Ovidian elegiac. But does he not perhaps ask it to accomplish too much? Does the neatness and concinnity—do

the associations of that elegiac allow it to reproduce the great music of the Hebrew Psalms? Here, as everywhere, the versions are admirably faithful. But the warmest admirers of Ovid will hardly claim for him that he is 'in the grand style.'

A. D. G.

St. John Damascene, Barlaam and Joasaph, with an English translation by G. R. WOODWARD and H. MATTINGLY. (Loeb Classical Library.) Pp. xx + 640. London: Heinemann, 1914. Price 5s.

It was a happy thought on the part of the editors of the Loeb Library to arrange for a translation of this charming tale in an early issue of their series. The story comes from India originally, but St. John of Damascus—the translators see no reason to doubt the traditional authorship—presented it to the world in a Greek dress. In this garb it delighted many generations of men, and became one of the most popular tales in all history. Not a few motives in later literature have their ultimate source in this book, including the tale of the caskets in *The Merchant of Venice*. The plot is briefly as follows: Joasaph, an Eastern monarch's son, is converted to Christianity by the monk Barlaam. His father uses every kind of device to thwart him of his purpose, and a terrible persecution of Christians ensues, but all in vain. In the end the King is converted, but presently dies. The son renounces his inheritance and becomes a hermit in the desert. Many conversations are given, in which are embodied some delightful apologues and also traditional arguments for Christianity, including the Apology of Aristides.

The translators have aimed at a style reminiscent of the Authorised Version, to harmonise with the numerous biblical quotations. The rendering is at times a trifle bizarre, as when τῶν θεηγόρων is translated 'the inspired clerks of God' and τὸ ἀνένδοτον 'unbuxomness,' but on the whole a great success has been achieved, the stately diction with its occasional homely word recalling the best seventeenth-century prose. The naive charm of the original has not

evaporated in the translation, and it is to be hoped that there will be many readers to be grateful to Mr. Woodward and Mr. Mattingly for having rescued the old tale from oblivion.

W. K. LOWTHER CLARKE.

Cavendish, Suffolk.

A propos d'Homère : Progrès et Recul de la Critique. Par L. LAURAND. Pp. 72. 2 fr.

THERE are certain French scholars who have the power of gathering up vast stores of knowledge without letting themselves be buried under it. They know all the recent books in all the languages, and they seem able to carry them in their heads and to give in a brief and lucid treatise a general view of their contents. Such, for instance, is Meillet's *Aperçu d'une Histoire de la Langue grecque*, and similar is this charming little brochure by the author of *Etudes sur le Style des Discours de Cicéron*.

The substance of the book is given in the following sentence (p. 43): 'Tandis que la méthode critique perfectionnée distingue, dans un seul et même écrivain, dans un seul et même livre, des différences de conception et d'idées, des différences de forme et de style, la critique homérique en était récemment encore à supposer que la moindre diversité suffit à prouver un poète différent.' M. Laurand begins with Wolf and his followers throughout the nineteenth century, who would note in Homer any little inconsistency or difference of style, 'et la moindre dissemblance suffisait à prouver l'existence de deux aèdes.' Then he gives us a summary of the work of the numberless scholars who busied themselves in tracing out similar phenomena in the writings of many authors, ancient and modern, Plato, for instance, and Cicero, Chateaubriand and Victor Hugo. This part of the treatise is specially valuable. It is surprising to find how many authors have been guilty of inconsistencies and contradictions, not to speak of variations of style. With the twentieth century we come to Blass who proclaims 'il est temps d'appliquer à Homère les mêmes

principes que nous nous sentons obligés d'employer pour tous les autres auteurs.' M. Laurand quotes from *Classical Review*, xx. (1906), p. 267, the review of Blass's 'Die Interpolationen' by 'M. Allen, dont les belles éditions de l'Iliade, de l'Odyssée, des Hymnes sont dans toutes les mains.' He concludes with a *résumé* of the most recent work on the Homeric Question. M. Laurand is writing a *Manuel des Etudes grecques et latines*: to judge from this little book he is well fitted for the task; he has learning, a sane judgment and a great gift for exposition.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

Platonische Aufsätze. By OTTO APELT. 8vo. 1 vol. Pp. 296. Leipzig: B. G. Teubner, 1912. M. 8.

THIS book contains twelve essays dealing with certain aspects of Plato's philosophy. The first three, entitled respectively, 'Der überhimmlische Ort,' 'Wahrheit,' and 'Disharmonien,' are concerned with pure philosophy. Four others, 'Das Prinzip der Platonischen Ethik,' 'Die Lehre von der Lust,' 'Der Wert des Lebens,' and 'Platon's Straftheorie,' discuss the practical bearing of Plato's doctrine. The remainder treat of minor questions connected with the dialogues.

In his treatment of Plato's ontology Herr Apelt makes a sharp distinction between 'Dialektik' and 'Weltansicht,' and shows that, if the same distinction had been clearer in the mind of Plato himself, the Idea and the Concept would not have been fused into one, and there would have been less uncertainty in his conclusions about the Ideal World. In regard to the important dialogue of the *Sophist* Herr Apelt takes the view that the definition of Being there is merely a dialectical shift, and does not indicate any new departure in Plato's ontology. He believes also that the Demiourgos or God of the *Timæus* is to be taken literally, as representing a creative power or first cause. Plato's ontological analysis, therefore, resolves the universe ultimately into Space, Ideas, which serve as models for created things, and a God with power to create.

In the essays dealing with Plato's attitude to the practical side of life Herr Apelt brings out the great reverence paid by Plato to the Reason or λόγος, and shows that it was his aim, in ethics and politics, to subject every sphere of life to the norms of Reason. The myth in the *Politicus* is, according to Herr Apelt, simply an exhortation to the individual to trust his own reason, in contrast with the trustful, child-like people of the age of Kronos (p. 84).

Among the essays on minor subjects is found an interesting discussion on the tactics of the Platonic Socrates, in which the practices of reducing the interlocutors to self-contradiction, and of introducing various doubles or shadows of Socrates into the dialogues are commented on with excellent illustrations.

Those who read this collection of essays will be very grateful to Herr Apelt for his vigorous and original treatment of some of the leading problems of Platonic theory.

MARIE V. WILLIAMS.

*Huguenot College, Wellington,
Cape Colony.*

Pessimismus und Weltflucht bei Platon.

By Dr. GUSTAV ENTZ. 8vo. I vol.
Pp. 191. Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr,
1911. M. 5.

WE have in this volume a singularly clear analysis and estimate of the pessimistic tendency in Plato's dialogues. This pessimism was to a certain extent the result of the Homeric view of life which tradition had handed down, and in the earliest dialogues it finds expression in an exposure of the corruption that permeated public life. Orphism brought a ray of hope when it taught that this life is not the sum-total of existence, but merely a preparation for the true life of which death is the beginning. This hope was eagerly seized by Plato, and, largely under its influence, he was led to construct that eternal world of ideas which remained untouched and uncontaminated by the transitoriness of material things. All ascetic doctrines, however, were rejected,

and the soul was to be nurtured not through the discipline of the body, but by a right control of conduct. A child-like optimism shines forth in the *Timaeus*, where the Good and Evil of the cosmos are both recognised, but the Good is given the upper hand. In Plato's old age the pessimistic tendency returned. In the dialogue called *The Laws* he realised that the ideal state is only a εὐχή, and sketched another second-best polity where the ideal should be followed as far as existing conditions might permit.

Dr. Entz does well to emphasise the religious and ethical significance of the Ideas, and to recognise that Dialectic was an ethical as well as an intellectual method. This view is exactly the thesis developed by Professor Stewart in his *Plato's Doctrine of Ideas*.

The analysis of the *Timaeus* and the contrast drawn between it and the earlier dialogues are on the whole just, but the ideal scheme of the *Philebus* and its relations with the *Timaeus* might have been more satisfactorily discussed.

Students of Platonism will find Dr. Entz' treatise a very stimulating, if not very original, book.

MARIE V. WILLIAMS.

*Huguenot College, Wellington,
Cape Colony.*

Tituli Faleriorum Veterum Linguis Falisca et Etrusca Conscripti. Edited by GUSTAV HERBIG. Leipzig, 1910.

SINCERE apologies are due to the readers of the *Classical Review* and to the distinguished editor of these Inscriptions for the long but scarcely avoidable delay in this notice of the work. It is an off-print of nearly 300 Inscriptions, contained in the second section of Vol. II. of the *Corpus* of Etruscan Inscriptions, published for the benefit of those who may wish to study the language of ancient Falerii without pledging themselves to the study of Etruscan proper. It is needless to say that the volume shows the accuracy and lucidity which mark all Dr. Herbig's work; and there are few sets of inscrip-

tions which more greatly need his rigorous methods of reproduction and editing. The gratitude which scholars will feel to him for this (as for the subsequent parts of the *C. I. E.*) is tempered only by the regret that the positive fruit of his labour is confined within rather narrow limits. The bulk of these inscriptions contain hardly more than a single word apiece, where even so much as that is complete; though when they are, they are often valuable as giving the Faliscan form of particular names. Two or three inscriptions, however, stand out from the rest, especially, to mention only those that have been most recently discovered, 8191 and 8079. The former (8191) is the epitaph of two sisters, married to different men, but buried together, of whom one calls herself *Cavia* and the other *Cavi*, the second being the wife of a man with a name inflected in Faliscan or Etruscan fashion (Gen. *Felicitate*); the parallel *Cavi: Cavia* illustrates prettily the well-known difference between the Etruscan and the Latin nom. fem. endings, as in *Vipi: Vibia*. 8079 is on a small clay urn, now in fragments, found in a grave, and offers a text of considerable interest, though unfortunately its reading and interpretation are very far from certain. It appears to contain a petition of some kind addressed to Ceres, and dealing with various interesting matters, among them *arcentelum*, which Dr. Herbig conjecturally interprets to mean 'money.' He has discussed the inscription at length in the 2nd Vol. of *Glotta*, 1909, p. 184. It is certainly a vow of some kind; conceivably a curse, like the Duenos inscription. The volume is particularly attractive because of the careful facsimiles, though it is hard to say how many of the Inscriptions really repay the expense which has been lavished upon them.

R. S. C.

Studien zur Lateinischen und Griechischen Sprachgeschichte. Von EMIL THOMAS. Berlin, 1912. M. 4.

THIS is an interesting collection of 36 short studies of words and phrases in colloquial Latin, chiefly in the text of

Petronius and Apuleius, which have not hitherto been understood, and many of which folk have wished to emend away. By the careful use of other sources of our knowledge of colloquial Latin, especially of Plautus, the author has in a great many places vindicated the manuscript text, and in all, I think, added something of value to our knowledge of Latin. The derivation of *apoculare*, a hybrid, meaning 'to put out of sight,' *vavato*, a jocose name for a baby ('the creature that says *va va*'), the explanation of the phrase *mulier quae mulier*, to mean 'a woman who is (really) a woman,' the restoration of the form *παπαποπλευτέον* in Cicero, *ad Att.* 10. 12. 2, and the explanation of *νυμφάσματα* in a Sibylline oracle (Diels, *Sibyll. Blätter*, p. 113), may be mentioned as particularly convincing.

The subjects of the remaining papers, which are likely to be very useful to students of colloquial Latin, are as follows:

<i>flagrare, deflagrare.</i>	<i>resecare.</i>
<i>refrigidire.</i>	<i>excipere.</i>
<i>pervaporare.</i>	<i>protegere.</i>
<i>multacia.</i>	<i>lacerare.</i>
<i>biberarius, bibaria.</i>	<i>subalapa.</i>
<i>por(i)cinum.</i>	<i>tuscularius.</i>
<i>madulsa.</i>	<i>assias, lupatria, dicterium.</i>
<i>tinctorium.</i>	<i>babaecalus.</i>
<i>delactus.</i>	<i>cator(o)gare.</i>
<i>ma(c)tare</i> (and the exclamations <i>tat</i> and <i>an</i>).	<i>stam(i)natus ducere.</i>
<i>inferiores.</i>	<i>tangomenas facere.</i>
<i>servire</i> , c. acc.	<i>contumelia, xerophagiæ sebeae.</i>
<i>horreor.</i>	<i>cacclistus.</i>
<i>execrabiliter.</i>	<i>isti eug' euge.</i>
<i>sincerus.</i>	<i>deuro de facere.</i>
<i>verax.</i>	

It may be presumed that Dr. Emil Thomas, whose book is dated from Berlin, is a different person from the senior and distinguished Professor Emile Thomas, of Lille, the editor of the *Verrines*, but his studies are interesting, and not unworthy of his name.

R. S. C.

LATIN COMEDY.

P. Terenti Phormio, ed. by J. Sargeant of Westminster School (Pitt

Press, with or without vocabulary, 3s.). This is a good edition for those who are just beginning the study of Latin Comedy. The editor likes Terence, and knows him well. The Introduction and Notes will stimulate interest and give most of the help that is likely to be needed. But in a good many places we should like a few more hints as to what is going on; for it is often difficult, even with some experience, to tell from the printed text how the words are spoken (e.g. 555), what is spoken aside, what is said ironically, and so on. Now and then the editor adds to the difficulty by a careless mistake: e.g. 751, 'might get him into trouble with his Lemnian [? Athenian] wife'; 310, 'Geta and Pamphila [? Phaedria] now go out'; 223, *quin tu impera*, 'just give no orders' ['no' for 'me'?). These little slips are as puzzling as that *Mrs.* for *Mr.* in Mr. Conrad's novel *Chance* (ch. ii., line 3, p. 31) which makes the careful reader run through the preceding chapter again to make sure that the lady has not been mentioned.

Plauti Aulularia, ed. by E. J. Thomas (Clarendon Press, 4s. 6d.), is suitable for a more advanced stage. The Notes (37 pp.) are helpful and full of information, especially on historical grammar, expressed as briefly as possible. On 340-1 *si quid uti voles . . . adfero* the editor says 'the imperative taking the place of the regular apodosis,' as if the use of the imperative in a conditional sentence were not quite regular. It is, of course, regular and frequent in Latin, as in English. On 656 on (*hunc*) *si amitto* (*hic abierit*) the note is 'The use of tenses in a dependent clause in older Latin is quite free; classical Latin would have the fut. perf.' Is the difference so great? Lebreton says, pp. 188 ff.: 'Je vais essayer de montrer . . . que l'usage de Cic. se rapproche sur ce point, plus qu'on ne le dit, de celui des comiques,' and he quotes a large number of examples, a large proportion, but by no means all, from the letters.

Professor Hauler has again revised Dziatzko's edition of the *Phormio* of Terence (Teubner, M. 4.80, bound M. 5.40). The book is meant, not for schoolboys, but for maturer students,

for whom it is to serve as an introduction to the reading of early Latin. For this purpose it is excellent. The editor has a very extensive knowledge of recent work in this field, and he has spared no pains to give full information and to arrange it well. He sets before us clearly and not at undue length what is known on any question, and on all doubtful points gives references to works where one can find the evidence more fully presented and discussed. The excellent Index will make the book useful as a handy reference work. The note on 514 *ne oppertus sies* needs revision; reference is made to Elmer's article in the *Amer. Journ. of Phil.*, XV. (1894), 133 ff., in which it was contended that the Pft. Subjv. in prohibitions was very rare and expressed strong feeling. Elmer's view has 'met with much criticism, not only as a general doctrine, but as applied to authors and periods' (Bennett, *Syntax of Early Latin*, I. 174). If it is referred to, it would be well to add a reference to Lebreton's very full discussion in his *Etudes sur la langue et la gram. de Cicéron*, pp. 293 ff., and to Kühner-Stegmann, *Ausf. Gram.*, II. 1. p. 189.

W. E. P. PANTIN.

Fr. Fessler. *Benutzung der philosophischen Schriften Ciceros durch Lactanz*. Pp. 1-56. Teubner. 1913.

THIS is a work by the Court Chaplain at Dresden, dedicated to his royal master. The writer discusses various questions connected with Lactantius—e.g. his birthplace, giving reference to other works on the subject. The 'Christian Cicero' is an interesting figure in literature, although he met with neglect in his generation, being, as Jerome remarks, *adeo in hac vita pauper ut plerumque etiam necessariis indiguerit*. Also, posterity looked on him askance, deeming him more meritorious as an assailant of paganism than as a defender of Christian dogma. Fessler, in this unpretending work, deals with the use of Cicero made by Lactantius in his *Institutiones*, and shows clearly that Lactantius was more influenced by

Cicero than by any other author. The works from which he drew most were the *De natura deorum*, *Tusculanae*, *Academica* and *De legibus*. He quotes from lost treatises—e.g. the *Hortensius* and *Consolatio*, also once from the *Pro Murena*, which nearly shared their fate. Fessler analyses Books I.-II., giving an account of their subject-matter and showing how the treatment is modelled upon Cicero. In the case of the remaining books (III.-VII.), he contents himself with a list of imitations, with references, to which he adds a subject-index. The work will be found useful.

ALBERT C. CLARK.

Queen's College, Oxford.

The Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides. By H. M. HUBBELL. 9 $\frac{3}{4}$ × 6 $\frac{1}{2}$. Pp. 84. (Yale University Press) Oxford: Clarendon Press. (\$1.25.) 5s. 6d. net.

THIS is a degree thesis which traces the influence of Isocrates not on the style but on the thought of later writers. The first section, which contains nothing new, sets forth the Isocratean idea of oratory. (The *idéai* seem to be better represented in English by 'common-place arguments' rather than by 'thought elements,' p. 7). The peculiar character of the *πρὸς Νικοκλέα* is explained by its being a mere collection of *idéai* on government and morality such as Isocrates put before his students. After this preliminary section the *De Oratore* is examined to prove that Cicero took his whole idea of the art of oratory from Isocrates. To both the orator is a statesman. The dichotomy between 'philosophy' and rhetoric is false. This theme is adequately developed, but there is nothing very striking in it. The orator-statesman was traditional in Greece, and it is only Plato's use of the term *φιλοσοφία* as confined to *θεωρητικὴ φιλοσοφία* that has made the case worth bringing forward at all. Cicero obviously admired Isocrates, but it is defending a thesis to trace the whole of Cicero's conception of the function of the orator to Isocrates. Still some of the parallels do prove that Cicero

was imitating, especially when he follows Isocrates in claiming various Athenian statesmen as orators on grounds of barest probability. Then the same is done for Dionysius and his *φιλόσοφος ῥητορική* and for Aristides. Parallels are deduced with great care and learning, but the theme is a little thin. And surely revision was needed here. *So far as I have observed, no writers notice oratorical ability in Solon or Clisthenes* (p. 36). *Aristides also praises Solon, who was adduced by Isocrates as an example of the orator-statesman* (p. 59). *These five statesmen form the basis for Aristides' claim that oratory and statesmanship are inseparably united. These are the same examples used by Isocrates (who adds to the list Clisthenes)* (p. 60)! *Dormitat Homerus with a vengeance. The book is beautifully produced.*

R. B. APPLETON.

Bibliotheca Philologica Classica et Archaeologica. (Catalogue de livres anciens et modernes aux prix marqués, No. 50). Large 8vo. Pp. 548. Leyde (Hollande): Burgersdijk and Niermans. 2 fl. (3s. 4d.).

Bibliographie Pratique de la Littérature Grecque des origines à la fin de la période Romaine. Par PAUL MASQUERAY. Pp. 334. Paris: Klincksieck. 5 f.

THE first of these two useful reference books, though but a trade catalogue, is a catalogue that occasionally supplements *Engelmann* on some old edition and is wonderful value for the price. It is not so full as *Klussmann*, but quite full enough for ordinary working purposes. Occasional notes are given as to the merit or rarity of some particular edition. There is a section on Neo-Latin authors, and nearly two hundred pages on books on the classics arranged under headings such as grammar, metric, history of literature, religion, etc. It represents, of course, the peculiarities of one bookseller's stock, but it is a very extensive stock of some sixteen thousand volumes. Certainly no classical scholar who is attempting to collect a small library should be without it.

The second is particularly useful to those who wish to know something about the manuscripts and scholia. Bibliographically, it is not very full, but it contains the most important things with full and useful comments. Published originally for the guidance of Professor Masqueray's own students at Bordeaux, it should be welcome to any student who does not want the more exhaustive and more expensive German works. It is divided into two books—before and after Aristotle—and classes the authors as historians, orators, etc. There is a subject, and also a general index.

R. B. APPLETON.

The Peace of Aristophanes. By B. B. ROGERS. Pp. i-xliii + 1-228. London: Bell, 1913. 10s. 6d.

WHETHER or no there was a second edition of the *Peace*, Mr. Rogers' excellent volume has now appeared for the second time, revised and augmented for the complete *Aristophanes*. There

is no need now to dwell on the merits of Mr. Rogers' series—the brilliant verse translation, the pleasant and shrewd commentary, the full and instructive critical notes. Mr. Rogers may be a little too much attached to the old and disinclined to the new: that is a quality which he shares with his author, and he always defends his position with good sense and temper. Since the date of his former book a large amount of work has been done on the *Peace*, and he seems to have mastered it all, even if some of it in his judgment has been but labour lost, e.g. the various speculations on the scenic difficulties; these he solves for himself by the supposition of a second stage drawn across the first, so as to give the higher level needed for the palace of Zeus. His excellent English trochaics match in attractiveness the Greek ones in which Hermes gives the true story of the Peloponnesian War and those which paint the life of the country, the weather, the fruitage, and the well-side where the violets are.

H. RICHARDS.

TRANSLATION

Σκόλιον δέ φασί τινες καὶ τὸ ὑπὸ Ὑβρίου
τοῦ Κρητὸς ποιηθέν. ἔχει δ' οὕτως.

Ἔστι μοι πλοῦτος μέγας δόρυ καὶ ξίφος
καὶ τὸ καλὸν λαισήιον, πρόβλημα χρωτός.
τούτῳ γὰρ ἄρῳ, τούτῳ θερίζω,
τούτῳ πατέω τὸν ἄδυν οἶνον ἀπ' ἀμπέλω·
τούτῳ δεσπότης μνωΐας κέκλημαι.

Τοὶ δὲ μὴ τολμῶντ' ἔχειν δόρυ καὶ ξίφος
καὶ τὸ καλὸν λαισήιον, πρόβλημα χρωτός,
πάντες γόνυ πεπτηότες ἄμυν
... κυνεῦντι τε δεσπόταν
καὶ μέγαν βασιλέα φωνέοντες.

Apud *Athenaeum*, 595 f.
(ed. Dindorf, 1827).

SONG: *From the Greek of Hybrias the Cretan.*

Great wealth is mine in spear and sword
And goodly shield of hides, to guard
My body from the foeman.

Therewith I reap, therewith I sow,
Therewith I make sweet vintage flow,
Therewith I give the world to know
That I'm a sturdy yeoman.

And them that shun the spear and sword
And goodly shield of hides, to guard
Their bodies from the foeman—
Down at my feet I make 'em fall,
Till grovelling low the recreants call:
'Thou art the master of us all,
A mightier lord is noman!'

J. LODGE.

15, Wexford Road, Wandsworth Common.

NOTES AND NEWS

WE have to apologise for our late appearance last month. It is not safe to criticise the Censor, so we will not lay the blame on him.

In a recent number of the *American Journal of Philology* (xxxv. 361), the Editor, Professor Gildersleeve, writes as follows:

... What one reviewer would be equal to a characterisation of the fifty odd contributions which make up the superb volume of *ESSAYS AND STUDIES* dedicated to that rare genius, William Ridgeway, on his sixtieth birthday, August 6, 1913 (Cambridge: At the University Press)? The cover is adorned by an escutcheon—the crest a camel couchant, the motto *MIHI GRAVATO DEUS*. Nothing more appropriate, crest and motto both, for the average editor in view of all this wealth of content, which no one, I venture to say, could take up so lightly as the honoured scholar to whom the volume is dedicated—himself equally at home in Classics and Archaeology, Mediaeval Literature and History; himself a dominant figure in Anthropology and Comparative Literature. ‘Take up so lightly,’ I have written, for it is the easy mastery of each subject and the flash of native genius that commend Ridgeway’s writings to those who can only learn from him. As a writer of dedicatory verses says:

Of tedious pedants though the world be full,
While Ridgeway lives Research can ne’er be
dull.

NOTES ON THE NORTHUMBER-
LAND AND DURHAM
CLASSICAL ASSOCIATION.

1. OUR Summer Expedition first visited the Saxon Church of Escomb, which has a Roman arch, and built into the wall a stone with a legionary number inscribed thereon; and secondly the famous hypocaust of Vinovia (Binchester).

2. We had a paper on November 14, by B. Anderton, M.A., on ‘Lipsius, a sixteenth-century Stoic at Louvain.’ The paper dealt in an appreciative manner with Lipsius’ life, his services to learning, and to various academic centres. His Stoicism was mainly illustrated from the *Manuductio ad Stoicam Philosophiam*, which was carefully summarized. The concluding part of the paper concerned Lipsius’ attitude to the character of Seneca.

Canon Cruickshank, in discussion, dwelt on Lipsius’ scholarship in relation to Tacitus in particular. Professor Dutt spoke of Lipsius as a Senecan scholar, and quoted both from the dedication of the edition of Seneca to Pope Paul V., and from the *de Constantia* of Lipsius’ passage which might literally be applied to the woes of Belgium to-day. The subject was an appropriate one on the eve of the fête-day of the King of the Belgians.

CORRESPONDENCE

THE TEUBNER PLINY.

To the Editors of THE CLASSICAL REVIEW.

JUST before the declaration of war, Herr W. A. Baehrens wrote to me from Berlin a letter, which eventually reached me, referring to two quotations from Kukula’s Latin preface to his edition of the younger Pliny which were made by me in my notice in *The Classical Review* of last June. Kukula’s remarks were obviously uncomplimentary to Baehrens’ edition of the

Panegyrici Latini, and as they appeared unlikely to be mistaken for models of scholarly *politesse*, they were cited by me without express commendation or condemnation. I have no intention of intervening in this continental quarrel; but, in fairness to Baehrens and to his edition, I should say that in his opinion a reference to the *Berlin. Philolog. Wochenschr.* of October 14, 1913, will enable readers to judge of Kukula’s attitude (‘Sie werden dann das Verfahren Kukulas besser beurteilen

können,' he says). He objects most of all to the charge of having introduced 'nefanda' into his text—'wofür ein Druckfehler *caberis* angeführt wird?'

Professor Merrill of the University of Chicago has very courteously written to me in connexion with the same article, indicating his accord with many of its suggestions and criticisms. He still, however, defends *me apud quemquam* in Pliny *Ep.* i. ix. 5 against Keil, Summers, and Kukula, who prefer *nemo apud me quemquam sinisteris sermonibus carpit*. I am not convinced by Professor Merrill, but I quote the argument from his letter:

'Pliny shows often enough his sensitiveness to criticism. Here he is contrasting the society-life of the city with the refreshing isolation and freedom of the country, where he is free from the consciousness of backbiting attacks and (he says politely) from the temptation to retort in kind. He has turned his back on the city.

What goes on there is nothing to him—he is talking about the country only.'

Professor Merrill explains that in the forthcoming larger edition of Pliny he edits Books I.—IX. independently, and Kukula the Trajan-letters and the Panegyric. It will not, therefore, be a real joint-editorship, though Kukula will assist in proof-reading throughout. Incidentally Professor Merrill gives the interesting information that his MS. for Books I.—IX. has been in Teubner's hands since a year last March, and about a half is printed; only, now that typesetters have been made into soldiers, the work is at a standstill.

Another important announcement, and to me a gratifying one, is that for the text he has not followed the B[=R]F tradition as closely as in 1903.

J. WIGHT DUFF.

Armstrong College,
October 31, 1914.

BOOKS RECEIVED

All publications which have a bearing on Classical Studies will be entered in this list if they are sent for review. The price should in all cases be stated.

* * *Excerpts or Extracts from Periodicals and Collections will not be included unless they are also published separately.*

- Benn (A. W.) *The Greek Philosophers*. Second edition. 9" × 5½". Pp. xxxvi + 620. London: Smith Elder and Co., 1914. Cloth, 18s. net.
- Bryant (E. E.) *A Short History of Rome*. 8" × 5½". Pp. viii + 262. Cambridge: University Press, 1914. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Cheesman (G. L.) *The Auxilia of the Roman Imperial Army*. 9" × 5¾". Pp. 192. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. Paper boards, 5s. net.
- Cook (A. B.) *Zeus: A Study in Ancient Religion*. Vol. I.: Zeus, God of the Bright Sky. 10" × 7½". Pp. xlv + 888, with 42 plates, 566 figures. Cambridge: University Press. Cloth, £2 5s. net.
- Hall (H. R.) *Aegean Archaeology*. An Introduction to the Archaeology of Prehistoric Greece. With many illustrations and a map. 8½" × 5¾". Pp. xxii + 270. London: P. Lee Warner. Cloth, 12s. 6d. net.
- Harry (J. E.) *The Greek Tragic Poets*. 9" × 6". Pp. 254. Cincinnati: The University Press, 1914. \$2.
- Kalypsos*. By Aldo Ferrabino. 8" × 5". Pp. 448. Omaggio: F. M. Bocca, 1914. L. 6.
- Latin Prose Grammar*. By E. L. Churchill and E. V. Slater. 8½" × 5½". Pp. x + 331. London: G. Bell and Sons, 1914. Cloth, 3s. 6d.
- Sihler (E. G.) *Cicero of Arpinum*. 8½" × 5½". Pp. xii + 487. Oxford: University Press (for the Yale University Press), 1914. Cloth, 10s. 6d. net.
- The Map and its Story* (A Physical Atlas). 12" × 10". Pp. 44. London: G. W. Bacon and Co., 1914. 1s. net.
- Walter Map, de Nugis Curialium*. Anecdota Oxoniensia, Mediaeval and Modern Series. Part XIV., by M. R. James. 9" × 8". Pp. xl + 288. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1914. 18s. 6d. net.
- Woodhouse (S. C.) *The Englishman's Latin Dictionary*. 6½" × 4½". Pp. iv + 491. London: G. Routledge and Sons, 1914. Cloth.

INDEX

I.—GENERAL INDEX.

A.

- Acharnians*, performance of the, at Oxford, 69 f.
 Achilles, character of, 130*a*, *b*
 Adam's *Plato: Moral and Political Ideals*, noticed, 177
Adcock (F. E.), The Source of Plutarch: *Solon* (XX.-XXIV.), 38 ff.
 advertisement, ancient methods of, 59*b*
 Aeneas Tacticus, 169 f.
Aeneid, growth of the, 232 ff.
 the Stoic εἰσαγωγή in the, 234*b*
 Aequi and Rutuli, 88*b*
Agar (T. L.), on Sappho's Ode, 189 f.
Agricola, notes on the, 43 ff.
 αἰνῶτοι κῆνθαροι, 223 ff.
 'Alcumena Euripidi', 40 f.
 Aldebaran, the Bright, 190 f.
 See also p. 267
Allen (T. W.), notice of Roemer's *Aristarch's Athetesen in der Homerkritik*, 141 f.
 notice of Smyth's *Composition of the Iliad*, 230 f.
 Amazon myths—embody traditions of the Hittites, 57 f.
 reflect the Cretan cult of the Mother, 58*b*
 Amphitheatrum Castrense, 26*b*
 ancient methods of communication, 58 f.
 town-planning, 244 ff.
Anderson (T. G. C.), notice of Bloch's *La République Romaine*, 107
Anderson (W. B.), Two Editions of Lucan, 235 ff.
 Andresen's revision of Halm's *Annals of Tacitus* (Teubner), noticed, 212 f.
 animals of the ancients, 53 f.
Anonymus de Rebus Bellicis, date of, 106*b*
 ἀνωγίς—δνωγίς, 229
 Apelt's *Platonische Aufsätze*, noticed, 281*b*, f.
 Apicius the gourmet, 66*b*
 Apollo, Cretan elements in the cults and ritual of, 62
 Apollonius Rhodius, Mooney's edition of, 15 ff.
 was he Librarian of the Alexandrian Library? 15*b*, f.
 his quarrel with Callimachus, 16*a*
 readings in, 16*b*, ff.
Appleton (R. B.), notice of Smith's *Greek Art and National Life*, 21 f.
 notice of *English Literature and the Classics*, 213
 notice of Hubbell's *Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides*, 285
 notice of two reference books, 28*b*, f.
aquai in Lucretius, 264 ff.

Archimedes:—

- editio princeps* of, 51*a*
 MSS. of, *ib.*
 new sources, 51*a*, *b*
 recent editions of, *ib.*
 Aristarchus of Samos, 22*a*, *b*
 Aristarchus' atheteses in Homer, 141 f.
 Aristotelian Enthymeme, the, 113 ff.
Arnold (E. Vernon), notice of Bevan's *Stoics and Sceptics*, 62 f.
 'Some Works on Syntax—a Reply,' 67 f.
 artaba, the Roman, 199*b*
 Aryans in Palestine, 269*b*
 Asopus, the Phliasian, 86 f., 156 f.
 ἀσθησέλιος in Eur. *I. A.* (6-7), 267
 See also pp. 190-1
 astrology, 271*b*, f.
 Athens, topography of, 166 f.
 Augustales, the, 92*b*
 Augustus, birthday of, 272*b*
 horoscope of, 273*a*, *b*
 Virgil's early relations with, 119 f.
 Αὐξάνιος, 197*b*, f.

B.

- Baebius Italicus, 182*b*
Bailey (Cyril), notices of Litchfield's *Cicero's Judgment on Lucretius* and Reid's *Lucretiana*, 100 ff.
 notice of Fowler's *Roman Ideas of Deity*, 241 ff.
 Ballou's *De clausulis a Flavio Vopisco Syracusio adhibitis*, noticed, 251*b*, f.
 Basil and Gregory of Nyssa, Stoic elements in, 178*b*, f.
 Baumgarten, Poland and Wagner, *Die Hellenistisch-roemische Kultur*, noticed, 250
 Baur's *Centauris in Ancient Art: the Archaic Period*, noticed, 104 f.
Bell (H. I.), notice of various writers on Graeco-Roman Egypt, 198 ff.
 Beneventan script, 209 f.
 Bennett's *Religious Cults associated with the Amazons*, noticed, 58*b*
 Bevan's *Stoics and Sceptics*, noticed, 62
Bibliotheca Philologica Classica et Archaeologica (Cat. de livres anciens et modernes aux prix marqués), noticed, 285*b*
 Bidez, *Vie de Porphyre*, noticed, 182*b*, f.
 birds of the ancients, 54 f.
 Bloch's *La République Romaine*, noticed, 107
 Blum's *De compositione numerosa dialogi Ciceronis de Amicitia*, noticed, 214

- BOOKS RECEIVED, 31 f., 71 f., 111 f., 143 f., 183 f., 216, 256, 288
- Botsford's (G. W. and L. S.), *A Source Book of Ancient History*, noticed, 99b
- Bouchier's *Life and Letters in Roman Africa*, noticed, 26b, f.
- Brinkgreve's *Statii Achilleis*, noticed, 67
- Brown (J. R.), notice of Gaetano de Sanctis' *Arith.*, 96 f.
- Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik, Lautlehre, Stammbildungs- und Flexionslehre, Syntax*, noticed, 60b, f.
- Buck (Carl D.), *Hoœe* as evidence for *Êsse*, 157b, f.
- Burnet (John), on the meaning of *λογος* in Aristotle's *Ethics*, 6 f.
- Burnet's *Die Anfänge der griechischen Philosophie*, noticed, 250a
- Bury's *The Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century, with a Revised Text of the Kletorologion of Philotheos*, noticed, 27b
- Bury (R. G.), notice of Mrs. Adam's *Plato: Moral and Political Ideals*, 177
- notice of Bidez' *Vie de Porphyre*, 182b, f.
- notice of Hackforth's *Authorship of the Platonic Epistles*, 231 f.
- notice of Teubner texts of Sextus Empiricus, Proclus, Diadochus, 270 f.
- Butler (H. E.), notice of Helm's *Apologia of Apuleius* (Teubner), 181b, f.
- Butler's (H. E.) *Propertius*, noticed, 175
- Butler's (H. Montague) *Some Leisure Hours of a Long Life*, noticed, 279b, f.
- Classical Association of Northumberland and Durham, 287
- of Victoria, 215a
- Cleopatra-Aphrodite, 200b
- Cohen's *De Magistratibus Aegyptiis externas Lagidarum Regni Provincias administrantibus*, noticed, 198 f.
- coinage of the Constantinian period, 28a
- coins of Maximinus, 28a
- Commodian, two books on, 139 ff.
- date of, 140
- Conway (R. S.), notes on *Culex*, 24-41 (supplementing Warde Fowler), 121 f.
- notice of Herbig's *Tituli Falviorum Veterum Linguis Conscripti*, 282 f.
- notice of Rosenberg's *The City State in Ancient Italy*, 274 ff.
- Cook Wilson's (Professor) view of the meaning of *λογος* in Aristotle, criticised, 1 ff., 6 f.
- Cooke, (G. A.), notice of McIntosh's *Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis*, 239 f.
- Cope on the Aristotelian enthymeme, 114 ff.
- Corinna, 229b
- 'Corintho-Attic' vases, export of, 164a
- Cornish, Postgate and Mackail's *Catullus, Tibullus, and the Pervigilium Veneris*, noticed, 138 f.
- CORRESPONDENCE, 29, 67, ff., 142, 256, 287
- Culex*, the, dedicated by Virgil to Octavian, 119 ff.
- probable date of, 120a
- cursum*, the Latin, 151 ff.
- Cynthia, 8a, 9b

D.

- C.
- Caesar's deification, 242b, f.
- Cagnat's *L'Armée romaine d'Afrique et l'occupation militaire de l'Afrique sous les empereurs*, noticed, 105 f.
- Cours d'épigraphie latine*, noticed, 107 f.
- Callimachus, new fragments of, 88a
- Calpurnius, note on, 268a
- Capricorn, Augustus born under, 272 f.
- Cardinali's *Studi Graccani*, noticed, 167 f.
- Caspari (M. O.), notice of Cardinali's *Studi Graccani*, 167 ff.
- notice of Gercke's *Entstehung der Aeneis*, 232 ff.
- Casson (S.), the Persian expedition to Delphi, 145 ff.
- Catullus, new translations of, 137 ff.
- Centaurs, their representation in ancient art, 104 f.
- Cheesman (G. L.), notice of Cagnat's *L'armée romaine d'Afrique*, 105 f.
- notice of Riese's *Das rheinische Germanien*, 255 f.
- chemical formulae in Greek papyri, 28b
- Chicago Papyri, fragments of hexameter poems in, 143b
- Cicero's judgment on Lucretius, 100 f., 142
- Clark (Albert C.), notice of Ballou's *De Clausulis a Flavio Vopisco Syracusio adhibitibus*, 251b, f.
- notice of Blum's *De compositione numerosa dialogi Ciceronis de Amicitia*, 214
- notice of Edmonds' *Greek Bucolic Poets*, 159 ff.
- notice of Fessler's *Benützung der philosophischen Schriften Cicero's durch Lactanz*, 284b, f.
- notice of new Teubner text of *De Senectute*, 205
- notice of Waltzing's *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius*, 64 f.
- Clarke (W. R. Lowther), notice of *Exempla Codicum Graecorum*, Vol. I. (Codices Mosquenses), 279
- notice of Gronau's *Poseidonius und die jüdisch-christliche Genesisexegesis*, 178b, f.
- notice of Woodward and Mattingly's *St. John Damascene, Barlaam and Joasaph*, 280b
- δαμνιον*, meaning of, in Xenophon, 185 ff.
- in Plato, 187b, f.
- datal suffix, the original Idg., 264a
- Davis' *Translations from Catullus*, noticed, 138 f.
- Demosthenes, notes on *Leptines*, 49b, f., 128
- Phormio*, 267b, f.
- Public Orations* (transl.), 142
- derivation of the word *πλεμος*, on the, 266 f.
- Didymus, Plutarch's use of, 38 ff.
- Dikaionmata: Auszüge aus Alexandrinischen Gesetzen und Verordnungen*, noticed, 23b, f.
- Donatus' Commentary on Terence, 66
- dreams, the reality of, 230
- Duff (T. Wight), notice of Kukula's text of Pliny the Younger (Teubner), 134 ff.
- See also *Correspondence*, 288
- Durance, the river, crossed by Hannibal, 123 ff.
- Durel's *Les Instructions de Commodien*, and *Commodien: Recherches sur la doctrine, la langue et le vocabulaire du poète*, noticed, 139 f.

E.

- Eddington (A. S.), notice of Neugebauer's *Tafeln für Sonne, Planeten und Mond nebst Tafeln der Mondphasen*, 179
- Edmonds (T. M.), the New Lyric Fragments, 73 ff., notice of Preisendanz's *Carmina Anacreontea*, 132 f.
- Edmonds's *Greek Bucolic Poets*, noticed, 159 ff.
- Ehrlich's *Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung*, noticed, 60
- emancipation of Roman women, the, 204 f.
- enclitic forms of *ἐγώ* and *σύ*, the, with special reference to John xx. 17, and Acts xxvi. 28, 227 f.
- English Literature and the Classics*, noticed, 213
- Ennius, metrical innovations of, 208a

- enthymeme, meaning of the word, in Aristotle, 113 ff.
 in Sophocles, Xenophon, Isocrates, *Rhetorica ad Alexandrum*, 117b
 in later Greek and Roman writers, 114a
 in medieval and modern logic, ib.
 in St. Thomas Aquinas, 118a
Entz's *Pessimismus und Weltflucht bei Platon*, noticed, 282
 epitaph on a gladiator, 197b, f.
Ernout's *Latin Morphology*, noticed, 253b
Etruscan League, the, 275a
 nom. fem. endings, 283a
Euripides, notes on—*Bacchae* (659), 48b; (677 sq.), 47 f.
Rhesus (287 sqq.), 87 f.
Ἡσίο as evidence for *ἑσίο*, 157b, f.

F.

- Faliscan inscriptions, 283a
Ferguson (W. S.), notice of Baumgarten, Poland, and Wagner's *Die Hellenistisch-romische Kultur*, 250
Fessler's *Benützung der philosophischen Schriften Ciceros durch Lactanz*, noticed, 284b, f.
Festus and Paulus Diaconus, Teubner texts of, 246 f.
Finsler's *Homer*, noticed, 129 f.
Fischer's (F.) *Thucydidis Reliquiae in Papyris et Membranis Aegyptiacis Servatae*, noticed, 251
Fischer's (H.) *Quaestiones Aeneanae*, noticed, 169 ff.
Fisher (C. D.), notices of Peterson's *Dialogus* and Hutton's *Agricola*, Germania, 214b, f.
Formigé's *Remarques diverses sur les Théâtres Romains*, noticed, 248b, f.
Fortuna, 242a, b
Fowler (W. Warde), note on *Aeneid* vii. (748-9), 88 f.
 notice of Thulins' *Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum*, 108b, f.
 note on *Culex* (ll. 24-41), 119 ff.
 notice of Lindsay's *Festus*, 246 f.
Fowler's *Roman Ideas of Deity in the last Century before the Christian Era*, noticed, 241 ff.

G.

- G.**, notice of Bury's *Imperial Administrative System in the Ninth Century*, 27 f.
Gaetano de Sanctis, *Arbis*, noticed, 96 f.
Gardner (E. A.), notice of Weller's *Athens and its Monuments*, 166 f.
 the Panathenaic Ship of Herodes Atticus, 225 f.
Gardner (P.), notice of Baur's *Centaurs in Ancient Art*, 104 f.
 notice of Perrot and Chipiez's *Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité*, 163 ff.
Gardner's *Principles of Greek Art*, noticed, 249
Garrod (H. W.), *agwai* in Lucretius, 264 ff.
 notice of Brinkgreve's *Statii Achilleis*, 67
 notices of Teuffel's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, and Schanz's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, 103 f.
 notice of Butler's *Propertius*, 175
 notice of Heseltine's *Petronius*, 253 f.
Garrod's *Manili Astronomicum. Liber II.*, noticed, 271 ff.
Garstang's introduction to Strong's *Syrian Goddess*, noticed, 61b

- Gaselee (S.)**, notice of Giarratano's *De Re Coquinaria*, 66b
 notice of Helm's text of the *Metamorphoses* of Apuleius, 181
 genitives of the first and fifth declensions, 264 ff.
genius of the paterfamilias, the, 241b
Gercke's *Entstehung der Aeneis*, noticed, 232 ff.
Giarratano's *De Re Coquinaria*, noticed, 66b
Giussani on Lucretius, 102b
Gloucester, Roman remains at, 172a
Godley (A. D.), notice of Butler's *Some Leisure Hours of a Long Life*, 279b, f.
Gow (T.), notice of Heath's *Aristarchus of Samos*, 22
Gracchi, history of the, 167 f.
Graeco-Roman Egypt, a review of various books on, 198 ff.
Granger (Frank), notice of Pöhlmann's *History of the Social Question in the Antique World*, 90 ff.
 notice of Teuffer's *Zur Geschichte der Frauenemanzipation in alten Rom*, 204 f.
Granger's *Roma Aeterna*, noticed, 211b
Greek astronomy, 22b
 final clauses, 203 f.
 mathematicians, 50b
 metrological tracts, 199b
 musical and stress accents, 60
 transcriptions of Latin, 158
 vase-painting, 164 f.
Gronau's *Poseidonius und die jüdisch-christliche Genesisexegese*, noticed, 178b, f.

H.

- H. (F.)**, *Portus Itius*, 82 ff.
 notice of Cagnat's *Cours d'épigraphie latine*, 107b, f.
 notice of Mommsen's *Gesammelte Schriften*, 180b, f.
 notice of Formigé's *Remarques diverses sur les Théâtres Romains*, 248
Hackforth's *Authorship of the Platonic Epistles*, noticed, 231 f.
Haines (G. R.), a few notes on the text of Marcus Aurelius, 219 ff.
Hall (H. E.), notice of Thompson's *New Decipherment of the Hittite Hieroglyphs*, 269 f.
Hall's *Companion to Classical Texts*, noticed, 133 f.
Hannibal's route through the Alps, 123 ff.
 as described by Polybius, 123 f., and by Livy, 125 f.
Hardy (E. G.), notice of Magoffin's *The Quinquennales*, 108
Hardy's *Roman Laws and Charters*, noticed, 176 f.
Hardy's *Shorter Aeneid*, noticed, 211a
Harrison (E.), notice of Pickard-Cambridge's *Public Orations of Demosthenes*, 142
Harrison (Miss J. E.), the meaning of the word *τελετή*, 36 ff.
 notice of Strong's *Syrian Goddess*, 61
 notice of Swindler's *Cretan Elements in the Cults and Ritual of Apollo*, 62
Harry (J. E.), an emendation of Euripides (*Bacchae*, 677-678), 47 f.
 on the Bright Aldebaran, 190 f.
Hauler's *P. Terenti Phormio* (Teubner), noticed, 284b
Haverfield (F.), notes on the *Agricola*, 43 ff.
 notice of Reid's *Municipalities of the Roman Empire*, 171 f.
Legions and Auxilia, 226 f.
Haverfield's *Ancient Town-Planning*, noticed, 244 ff.
Heath (Sir T. L.), notice of some mathematical books, 50 ff.
Heath's *Aristarchus of Samos*, noticed, 22

- Heiberg's *Archimedis opera omnia cum commentariis Eutocii* (Vols. I., II.), ; *Heronis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt omnia* (Vol. IV.); *Heronis definitiones*, etc.; noticed, 50 ff.
 heliocentric theory of the universe dates from Aristarchus of Samos, 22b
 Helm's *Apulei Platonici Madaurensis Metamorphoseon Libri XI.*, and *Apulei pro se de Magia liber (Apolo- gia)*, noticed, 181 f.
 Hera Teleia, 36b, f.
 Heracleides Ponticus, 22b
 Herodes Atticus, 225
 Heron, the Teubner edition of, 52
 MSS. of, *ib.*
 Hermippus, Plutarch's use of, 38 ff.
 Heseltine's *Petronius* (Loeb Series), noticed, 253b, f.
 Hilberg's *S. Hieronymi Epistolae II. (Corpus Scrip- torum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum)*, noticed, 65
 Hill (G. F.), notice of Maurice's *Numismatique Con- stantiniense*, 28
 notice of Wissowa and Kroll, *Pauly's Real- Encyclopädie*, 177 f.
 Hirst (G. M.), note on Statius, *Silvae* I. vi. (75-80), 158b, f.
 Hitchcock (F. R. Montgomery), notes on the *Com- mitorium* of Orientius, 41 ff.
 Hittite hieroglyphs, a new decipherment of, 269 f.
 Hittites, the, identified with the Amazons, 57 f.
 were they Aryans? 269 f.
 Holmes (T. Rice), F. H. on Portus Itius (*see* Vol. XXVII. 258 ff.), 45 ff.
 Portus Itius, 193 ff.
 Holmes's *Caesar de Bello Gallico*, noticed, 172 ff., 249
 Homeric literature, recent, 128 ff.
 geography, 131b.
 Homeric Hymns, notes on the, 221 ff.
 horoscope of Augustus, 273a, b
 of Horace, 273b
 Hosius's *M. Annaei Lucani Belli Civilis Libri Decem* (Teubner), noticed, 235 f.
 house-planning, ancient Syrian, 165b
 Housman (A. E.), *Ἀσπρὸν οἰκίος* in Eur. *I. A.* (6, 7), 267
 How (W. W.), notice of Holmes's *Caesar de Bello Gallico*, 172 ff.
 notice of Riccardi Press Edition, 249
 Hubbell's *Influence of Isocrates on Cicero, Dionysius and Aristides*, noticed, 285
 Hude's *Lysias*, noticed, 12 ff.
 Humphrey's *De Corona*, noticed, 98
 Hunt (A. S.), *The New Lyric Fragments*, 126 ff.
 notice of *Dikaionmata*, 23
 notice of Lesquier's *Papyrus de Magdola*, 24
 notice of Lagercrantz's *Papyrus Graecus Hol- miensis*, 28
 notice of *Veröffentlichungen aus der Papyrus- Sammlung*, 250 f.
 Hunter (L. W.), notice of Fischer's *Quaestiones Aeneanae*, 169 ff.
 Hutchinson (W. M. L.), Pindar, *Nem.* III. 3: a Reply, 156 f.
 Hutton's *Agricola, Germania* (Loeb Series), noticed, 215
- I.
- illiterates in Egypt, statistics of, 105a
 insects of the ancients, 55b
- J.
- Jackson (J.), notice of Vollmer's *Poetae Latini Minores*, 182
 Jones (H. Stuart), notice of Taylor's *Cults of Ostia*, 26
- Jones (H. Stuart), notice of Platner's *Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome*, 26
 Jones' *Catalogue of the Sculptures of the Museo Capi- tolino*, noticed, 24b, f.
 Jones' *Companion to Roman History*, noticed, 252b, f.
 Juvenal's *Satires* interpreted in the light of bio- graphical data, 103b
- K.
- Kaines Smith's *Greek Art and National Life*, noticed, 21 f.
 Karsten's *Terentian Scholia*, noticed, 66
 Keller's *Die Antike Tierwelt*, noticed, 53 ff.
 Keene (C. H.), notice of Karsten's *Terentian Scholia*, 66
 notice of Sargeaunt's *Terence*, 174
 Knuenz's *De enuntiatibus Graecorum finalibus*, noticed, 203 f.
 Kramer's *Valerius Flaccus*, noticed, 19 ff.
 Kukula's *C. Plini Caecili Secundi Epistularum Libri Novem Epistularum ad Traianum Liber Panegyricus* (Teubner), noticed, 134 ff.
- L.
- Lactantius, 284b, f.
 Lagercrantz's *Papyrus Graecus Holmiensis, Recepte für Silber, Steine und Purpur*, noticed, 28
 Lamb (W. R. M.), notice of Fischer's *Thucydides Reliquiae*, 251
 Lawson's *Modern Greek Folklore*, quoted, 263a
 Legions and Auxilia, 226 f.
 Lendrum (W. T.), note on Pindar, *Nem.* III. (3), 86 f.
 Leo, Professor, obituary notice of, 30 f.
 Leo's *History of Latin Literature*, noticed, 206 ff.
 Leonhard's *Hettiter und Amazonen*, noticed, 57
 Lesquier's *Papyrus de Magdola*, noticed, 24
 Leukas-Ithaka, 129b, 131b
 Lex Julia Municipalis, 176a, b
 Licinia, 168a, b
 Thoria, 168b
Lexicon Terentianum, a projected, 29b
 Lindsay (W. M.), notice of Ernout's *Latin Mor- phology*, 253
 obituary notice of Professor Leo, 30 f.
 Lindsay's *Festus* (Teubner), noticed, 246 f.
 Litchfield's *Cicero's Judgment on Lucretius*, noticed, 100 ff.
 Livius Andronicus, 207a, b
 Livy (XXI. 31, 32), note on, 125 f.
 sources of, 125b
 λόγος, on the meaning of in certain passages of Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics* (A. R. Lord), 1 ff.
 on the meaning of, in Aristotle (J. Burnet), 6
 See Vol. XXVII. 113 ff.
 Lodge (J.), Song: from the Greek of Hybrias the Cretan, 287
 Loew's *Beneventan Script: a History of the South Italian Minuscule*, noticed, 209 f.
 Lord (A. R.), on the meaning of λόγος in certain passages in Aristotle's *Nicomachean Ethics*, 1 ff.
 See Vol. XXVII. 113 ff.
 Lucan, two editions of, 235 ff.
 Lucian's *De Dea Syria*, Professor Strong's transla- tion of, 61
 Lucretiana, 100 ff.
 Lysias, Hude's edition of, 12 ff.
 editions of, 12a
 primary MS. of 12b, f.
 the Florence MS. of, 13b, f.
 work of previous scholars on, 14a, b
 notes and suggestions on text of, 14b, f

M.

- M. (J. W.)**, on the *Mensae* of *Aeneid* III. (257) and VII. (116), 89t, f.
Macnaghten (R. E.), Socrates and the δαίμωνιον, 185 ff.
 Magoffin's *The Quinquennales*, noticed, 108
 Majer-Leonhard's *Ἀργάμματα*, noticed, 105
 Man-god, the idea of the, 242b
 Manatt's *Aegean Days*, noticed, 28b, f.
 Manitius' *Des Claudius Ptolemäus Handbuch der Astronomie aus dem griechischen übersetzt*, noticed, 53
Marchant (E. C.), note on Plato, *Phaedo*, p. 105a, 228 f.
 Marcus Aurelius, notes on the text of, 219 ff.
 Marius' camp in Gaul, 126b
 Marouzeau's *Conseils pratiques pour la traduction de la Latine*, noticed, 211b
 Mars, the Central Italian cult of, 89a
 Masqueray's *Bibliographie pratique de la Littérature grecque*, noticed, 286b
Matthaei (L. E.), notice of Tenney Frank's *Roman Imperialism*, 276 f.
 Maurice's *Numismatique Constantinienne*, noticed, 28
 Mayor (Dr. J. B.), on N.T. use of ἐνι and ἐνερσι, αἰεὶν and αἰεῖσθαι, 191 ff.
 McIntosh's *Study of Augustine's Versions of Genesis*, noticed, 239 ff.
 Meillet's *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*, noticed, 23
mensae, in two passages of the *Aeneid*, 89b, f.
 Mills's *Thucydides II.* (introduction by Stuart Jones), noticed, 99a
 Minucius Felix, Waltzing's edition of, 64b
 Mitannians, the, 269b, f.
 Mommsen's *Gesammelte Schriften*, noticed, 180b, f.
 monotheism, the State-cult of Jupiter as evidence for primitive, 243
 Mooney's *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*, noticed, 15 ff.
 MSS. :—
 of *Anacreontea*, 132 f.
 Archimedes, 51
 de Natura Deor., 64b, f.
 de re coquinaria, 66b
 Heron, 52
 Lucretius (the Leyden), 102b
 Minucius Felix, 64b
 Pliny the Younger, 134 f.
 St. Jerome, 65 f.
 Murray's *Rhesus*, noticed, 201
 musical accent predominant in Greek until the fourth century, 60
 Mutschmann's *Sextus Empiricus*, noticed, 270 f.

N.

- Naevius, 207b
Naylor (H. Darnley), the enclitic forms of ἐγώ and σὺ, with special reference to John xx. 17 and Acts xxvi. 28, 227 f.
 Neher's *Anonymus de Rebus Bellicis*, noticed, 106
 Nengebauer's *Tafeln für Sonne, Planeten und Mond nebst Tafeln der Mondphasen*, noticed, 179
 See also p. 272b
 New Lyric Fragments, the, 73 ff., 126 ff.
Nicklin (T.), notice of Garrod's *Manili Astronomicon, Liber II.*, 271 ff.
 notice of Zimmern's *The Greek Commonwealth*, 93 ff.
 Nicklin's *A Greek Vocabulary for the Use of Schools*, noticed, 99

- NOTES, 47 ff., 84 ff., 128, 156 ff., 196 ff., 227 ff., 266 ff.
 NOTES AND NEWS, 69 ff., 109 ff., 143, 215 f., 287

O.

- O. (C.)**, notice of Neher's *Anonymus de Rebus Bellicis*, 106
 OBITUARY, 30 f.
 Odyssey, unity of the, 131a
 Orientius, notes on the *Commonitorium* of, 41 f.
 ORIGINAL CONTRIBUTIONS, 1 ff., 33 ff., 73 ff., 113 ff., 145 ff., 185 ff., 217 ff., 257 ff.
Owen (A. S.) notices of Way's *Theocritus* and *Quintus Smyrnaeus*, 97 f.
 Owen's *A Brief History of Greece and Rome*, noticed, 99b

P.

- Panathenaic Ship of Herodes Atticus, the, 225 f.
Pantin (W. E. P.), notice of Hauler's *P. Terenti Phormio*, 284b
 notice of Kalinka's *Commentationes Anipontanae*, 203 f.
 notice of Laurand's *A propos d'Homère*, 281
 notice of Sargeant's *P. Terenti Phormio*, 283b
 notice of Thomas' *Plauti Aulularia*, 284a, b
 Papyri :—
 Chicago, 143
 Halle, 23b, f.
 Lille, 24a
 Oxyrynch. (Part X.), 126 f.
 Upsala, 28b
 Pasquali's *Proeli Diadochi in Platonis Cratylum Commentaria*, noticed, 271a, b
 Pater's *Marius the Epicurean* (Medici Society), noticed, 24
Paton (W. R.), ἀνωσις—δνωσις, 229
 Corinna, 229
Pearson (A. C.), ἀνταῖοι κἀνθαροί, 223
 notice of Burnet's *Anfänge der griechischen Philosophie*, 250
 Perrot and Chipiez, *Histoire de l'Art dans l'Antiquité*, noticed, 163 ff.
 Persian Expedition to Delphi, the, 145 ff.
 Delphic version of, 145 ff.
 real object of, 150 f.
Pervigilium Veneris, Mackail's text and translation of the, 137b
 Peterson's *Taciti Dialogus* (Loeb Series), noticed, 214b, f.
 Petschenig's *S. Ambrosii opera* (Corpus. Eccles. Script. Lat.), noticed, 254b, f.
Phaedo, note on two suspected passages in the, 85 f.
Phillimore (J. S.), in *Propertium retractationes selectae*, 7 ff., 79 ff.
 notice of Durel's *Les Instructions de Commodien, and Commodien*, 139 ff.
 Philotheos, Professor Bury's revised text of, 27b
 Phylacus, the hero, 147b
 Pickard-Cambridge's *Public Orations of Demosthenes*, noticed, 142
 pigmies, ancient accounts of, confirmed, 56a
 Pindar, *Nem.* III. 3, note on, 86 f.
 a Reply, 156 f.
 Pisidian Stelae, 196 f.
 Pisistratus, 06b, f.
 Plasberg's *Paradoxa, Academica, Timaeus, De Natura Deorum, De Divinatione, De Fato*, noticed, 63 f.

- Platner's *Topography and Monuments of Ancient Rome*, noticed, 26
- Pliny the Younger, Teubner text of, 134 ff., 288
- pluperfect used for aorist by Propertius, 104
- Plutarch's *De Pythiae Oraculis*, notes on, 217 ff.
- Moralia*, 257 ff.
- source for Solon (20-24), 38 ff.
- Pöhlmann's *History of the Social Question in the Antique World*, noticed, 90 ff.
- Polybius III. 47-50, note on, 123 ff.
- Porphyry, 182b f.
- conjectural readings in, 183b
- Portus Itius, 45 ff., 82 ff., 193 ff.
- See also Vol. XXVII. 258 ff.
- Posidonius, 63b, 178a
- Postgate (J. P.), on Thucydides II., 48 (3), 84 f.
- Ἀνέκδοτα*, 197b. f.
- Powell (J. U.), note on Euripides (*Bacchae*, 659), 48b
- on a new fragment of Callimachus' *Αἴτια*, 88
- Dr. J. B. Mayor on the use of *ἐν* and *ἐνέσθι*, *αἰρεῖν* and *αἰρεῖσθαι*, in the New Testament, 191 ff.
- Preisendanz's *Carmina Anacreontea*, noticed, 132 f.
- Princeton expeditions to Syria, 165 f.
- Proetidae, story of the, 37
- Propertium, *Retractationes Selectae* in, 7 ff., 79 ff.
- prose metre, two dissertations on, 214
- rhythm in Welsh and English, with special reference to the Latin *Cursus*, 151 ff.
- proverbs about treasure-trove, 263a
- Ptolemaic Egypt, judicial system of, 201
- Ptolemy Soter, cult of, 200a
- Ptolemy's *Syntaxis*, German translation of, 53
- Pythagorean astronomy, 22b
- R.
- Reed (J. S. Blake), notice of Hardy's *Roman Laws and Charters*, 176
- Rehdanz and Carnuth's *Anabasis* of Xenophon, noticed, 98b
- Reid (J. S.), notice of Bouchier's *Life and Letters in Roman Africa*, 26 f.
- notice of Riepl's *Ancient Methods of Communication*, 58 ff.
- notice of Haverfield's *Ancient Town Planning*, 244 ff.
- Reid's *Lucretiana*, noticed, 102 f.
- Municipalities of the Roman Empire*, noticed, 171 f.
- Reiter's *S. Hieronymi in Hieremian Libri Sex (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiasticorum Latinorum)*, noticed, 65b, f.
- Rennie (W.), on two passages in Demosthenes' *For Phormio*, 267b, f.
- Reviews, 12 ff., 50 ff., 90 ff., 128 ff., 159 ff., 198 ff., 230 ff., 269 ff.
- Rhone, Hannibal's march along the, 123 ff.
- Richards (Herbert), notice of Hall's *Companion to Classical Texts*, 133 f.
- notice of Rogers' *The Peace of Aristophanes*, 286
- on Plutarch's *Moralia*, 257 ff.
- Riepl's *Ancient Methods of Communication*, noticed, 58 f.
- Riese, *Das rheinische Germanien*, noticed, 255 f.
- rite of adolescence-initiation, the, 36 ff.
- Ritzenfeld's *Procli Diadochi Lycii Institutio Physica*, noticed, 271b
- Roberts (W. Rhys), *Prose Rhythm in Welsh and English*, with special reference to the Latin *Cursus*, 151 ff.
- Robinson Ellis, Professor Gildersleeve's reminiscences of, 70
- Roemer's *Aristarch's Athetesen in der Homerkritik*, noticed, 141 f.
- Homerische Aufsätze*, noticed, 130
- Rogers' *The Peace of Aristophanes*, noticed, 286
- Roma Quadrata, 245b
- Roman army, the, in Africa, 105 f.
- topography, 26b
- Romans, mixed origin of the, 71
- Rose (H. J.), 'Fairy Gold'—an ancient belief, 202 f.
- note on Soph. *O.T.* (980-2), 230
- Rothe's *Die Odyssee als Dichtung und ihr Verhältnis zur Ilias*, noticed, 130 ff.
- Rouse (W. H. D.), notice of Jones' *Companion to Roman History*, 252 f.
- notice of Majer-Leonhard's *Ἀργύμματα*, 105
- notice of Manatt's *Aegean Days*, 28 f.
- notice of Pater's *Marius the Epicurean* (Medici Society), 24
- notice of the Princeton Expeditions to Syria, 165 f.
- notice of Watson's *Vives on Education*, 247 f.
- Roxburgh (J. F.), notice of Stuttaford's *Poems of Gaius Valerius Catullus*; Cornish, Postgate, and Mackail's *Catullus, Tibullus and the Pervigilium Veneris*; Davis' *Translations from Catullus*; 137 ff.
- S.
- Σ., notices of school books, 98 ff., 277 f.
- S. (R. C.), hendecasyllabic rendering of Middleton's 'Oh, silver girl,' 30
- St. Augustine's *Versions of Genesis*, 239 f.
- St. Jerome's *Epistles*, 65a, b
- in *Hieremian*, 65 f.
- his free treatment of his Vulgate text, 65b
- St. Thomas Aquinas on the enthymeme, 118a
- San Nicolò's *Ägyptisches Vereinswesen zur Zeit der Ptolemäer und Römer*, noticed, 200
- Sandys (Sir John), note on Demosthenes, *Leptines*, 128
- notice of Hude's *Lysias*, 12 ff.
- notice of Keller's *Die Antike Tierwelt*, 53 ff.
- Sappho's *Ode*, 189 f.
- Sargeaunt's *P. Terenti Phormio*, noticed, 284
- Terence: with an English Translation* (Loeb Library), noticed, 174 f.
- Sayce (A. H.), *Pisidian Stelae*, 196 f.
- Schanz's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, noticed, 103 f.
- school books, noticed, 98 ff., 210 ff.
- scorpions, supposed suicide of, explained, 57b
- Seaton (R. C.), notice of Mooney's *The Argonautica of Apollonius Rhodius*, 15 ff.
- The Aristotelian *Enthymeme*, 113 ff.
- Semeka's *Ptolemäisches Prozessrecht*, noticed, 201
- Shackle (R. J.), Calpurnius, *Idyll V.* (60-61), 268a
- Demosthenes' *Leptines* (139), 49b, f.
- Valerius Flaccus *V.* (565), 268b
- Sheppard (J. T.), note on *Rhesus* (287 ff.), 87 f.
- Shewan (A.), Greek Elegiac rendering of 'The radiant morn hath past away'; notices of (1) Van Leeuwen's *Homeri Carmina*; (2) Finsler's *Homer*; (3) Roemer's *Homerische Aufsätze*; (4) *Die Odyssee als Dichtung und ihr Verhältnis zur Ilias*, 128 ff.
- SHORT NOTICES, 21 ff., 60 ff., 104 ff., 141 f., 177 ff., 213 ff., 247 ff., 279 ff.
- signalling, ancient military methods of, 59a
- Simbeck's *M. Tulli Ciceronis Cato Maior de Senectute Liber* (Teubner), noticed, 205 f.
- Skaras (Saras), the river, 123b, 124b, 125b, f.
- was it the Durance? 126
- the forms *Ισάπας*, *Ισάπα*, *ib.*
- Smyth's *Composition of the Iliad*, noticed, 230 f.
- Social Question, history of the, in the antique world, 90 ff.

Socrates and the *δαίμων*, 185 ff.
 Solon, Plutarch's sources for the life of, 38 ff.
Sonnenschein (E. A.), 'Alcmena Euripidi,' 40 f.
 notice of Westaway's *Quantity and Accent in the Pronunciation of Latin*, 213 f.
 Sophocles, *O. T.* 980-2, note on, 230
 Statius, *Silvae*, I. vi. 75-80, note on, 158b, f.
 Steiner's *Der Fiskus der Ptolemaeer*, noticed, 200b, f.
 Stoicism, influence of, on Roman life and literature, 208b
 Stoics and Sceptics, 62 f.
 stress accent does not emerge in Greek until the fourth century, 60
Strijd (J. H. W.), *Ad Plutarchi De Pythiae Oraculis*, 217 ff.
 Strong's *Syrian Goddess*, noticed, 61
 Stuttaford's *Poems of Gaius Valerius Catullus*, noticed, 137 f.
 subjunctive with short vowel, 18a
Summers (Walter C.), notice of Kramer's *Valerius Flaccus*, 19 ff.
 on Dryden and Statius, 268b, f.
 Swindler's *Cretan Elements in the Cults and Ritual of Apollo*, noticed, 62

T.

T. (E. M. W.), notice of Jones' *Catalogue of the Sculptures of the Museo Capitolino*, 24 f.
 notice of Gardner's *Principles of Greek Art*, 249
Taylor (Margaret E. T.), notes on two suspected passages in the *Phaedo*, 85 f.
 Taylor's *Cults of Ostia*, noticed, 25b, f.
 Teanum Sidicinum, 10b
 τελετή, meaning of the word, 36 ff.
 Tenney Frank's *Roman Imperialism*, noticed, 276 f.
 Terence, *Scholia* of the *Commentary of Donatus* on, 66
 Teufer's *Zur Geschichte der Frauenemanzipation in alten Rom*, noticed, 204 f.
 Teuffel's *Geschichte der römischen Literatur*, noticed, 103
 Thomas' *Plauti Aulularia*, 284
 Thompson's *First Year Latin Book*, noticed, 210
 Thompson's (R. Campbell) *A New Decipherment of Hittite Hieroglyphs*, noticed, 269 f.
 Thucydides II. 48.3, note on, 84 f.
 Thulins' *Corpus Agrimensorum Romanorum*, noticed, 108b, f.
 Thumb's revision of Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik* (fourth edition), noticed, 60b, f.
 Tibullus, Postgate's translation of, 138a
 treasure-finding, modern Greek superstitions about, 262
 Tristram's *Land of Israel*, quoted, 89a
Turner (R. L.), notice of Meillet's *Aperçu d'une histoire de la langue grecque*, 23
 notice of Brugmann's *Griechische Grammatik*, 60 f.
 notice of Ehrmann's *Untersuchungen über die Natur der griechischen Betonung*, 60

U.

Underhill (G. E.), Aristotle, *Prior Analytics*, II. (23), 33 ff.

V.

Valerius Flaccus, note on, 268b
 MSS. of, 20 f.
 Statius imitates, 20b, f.
 Teubner editions of, 19 ff.
 Van Leeuwen's *Homeri Carmina*, noticed, 128 f.
 variety of rhythm, 155b

vase-painting, its relation to the great mural paintings, 163a
 vase paintings illustrating the lost *Alkmene* of Euripides, 40b
Veröffentlichungen aus der Papyrus-Sammlung der K. Hof- und Staatsbibliothek zu München, noticed, 250b, f.
 Verrius Flaccus, 246b
Versions, 30, 111, 287
 Viedebant's *Quaestiones Epiphaniae metrologicae et criticae*, noticed, 199
 Virgil and the boy Octavian, 119 ff.
 Virgil, notes on:
 Aen. VII. (748-9), 88 f.
 on the *mensae* of *Aen. III.*, 257, and *VII.* (116), 89 f.
 Culex (24-41), 119 ff.
 Vollmer's *Poetae Latini Minores*, noticed, 182
 Vrba and Zycha's *S. Aureli Augustini Opera (Corpus Eccles. Script. Lat.)*, noticed, 254

W.

Walters (C. F.), notice of Weissenborn's *Titi Lini a.u.c. libri*, 179b, f.
 Waltzing's *M. Minucii Felicis Octavius*, noticed, 64 f
Watson (E. W.), notices of *Hieronymi Epistolae* and *Hieronymi in Hieremian (Corpus Scriptorum Ecclesiast. Lat.)*, 65
 notices of *S. Aureli Augustini Opera*, and *S. Ambrosii Opera*, 254 f.
 Watson's *Vives on Education*, noticed, 247 f.
 Way's *Theocritus and Quintus Smyrnaeus* (translations), noticed, 97 f.
 Weis-Liebersdorf's *Diadochus de Perfectione Spirituali*, noticed, 271b
 Weissenborn's *Titi Lini a.u.c. libri*, noticed, 179b, f.
 Weller's *Athens and its Monuments*, noticed, 166 f.
 Westaway's *Quantity and Accent in the Pronunciation of Latin*, noticed, 213b, f.
White (Hugh G. Evelyn), some notes on the Homeric Hymns, 221 ff.
Wilkinson (Spenser), note on Polybius III. 47-50, and Livy XXI. (31, 32), 123 ff.
 William of Moerbeke's translation of Archimedes, 51a
Williams (Marie V.), notice of Apelt's *Platonische Aufsätze*, 281b, f.
 notice of Entz's *Pessimismus und Weltflucht bei Platon*, 282
 Wissant as a medieval port, 46 f., 83
 water-supply of, 47, 83 f., 194b, ff.
 Wissowa and Kroll's *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie (Hes-tiaia-Hyagnis)*, noticed, 177b, f.
Witton (W. F.), on the derivation of the word *πόλεμος*, 266 f.
 Woodward and Mattingly's *St. John Damascene, Barlaam and Joasaph*, noticed, 280b
Wright (F. A.), note on the word *κρήδεμνον*, 49
 wryneck as a magical bird, the, 54b

X.

X., notice of Leonhard's *Hettiter und Amazonen* and Bennett's *Religious Cults associated with the Amazons*, 57 f.

Z.

Zimmern's *Greek Commonwealth*, noticed, 93 ff.

II.—INDEX LOCORUM.

- A.
- Alcaeus:—
(*Oxyrynch. Pap.* 1233 *fr.* 1), 75*b* f., 127*b*; (*fr.* 2), 76*b* f.; (*fr.* 32), 77*a*, *b*; (*Pap.* 1233 *fr.* 4), 77*b*; (*Pap.* 1234 *fr.* 3), 77*b* f.
- Apollonius Rhodius:—
Argonautica I. (103, 269), 17*b*; (372, 517), 16*b*; (934 coll. Cat. iv. 19 *sqq.*, *Aen.* v. 831), 17*b*; (987), 16*b*; (1216), 17*b*; II. (590, 1179), 17*b*; III. (26, 91, 321, 641), 18*a*; (745), 16*a*; (1383, 1393), 18*b*; IV. (501), 18*b*; (1405 *sqq.*, 1423 *sqq.*), 263*b*; (1646), 17*a*
- Apuleius:—
Apol. c. 9 (p. 11, ll. 17, 19), c. 39 (p. 45, l. 1), 181*b*
Met. xi. (18), *ib.*
- Aristotle:—
Anal. Prior. II. (23 coll. I. 30, *Anal. Post.* I. 18, 31, 34, II. 2, 13, 17, 19), 33 ff.; (27), 118*b*
Met. A. 3 (1070^a 30), *ib.* 4 (1070^b 32), 7*a*
Nic. Eth. I. (1102^b 14, 17, 24), 3*b* f.; II. (1103^b 31), *ib.* (1103^b 33), 6*b* (1107*a*), 6 f.—*see also* Vol. XXVII, 113 ff.; VI. (1138^b 19), 3*a*, (1139^a 23), *ib.*, (1144^b 27), 2*a*, *b*, 6*b* f.; VII. (1149^a 25), 3*a*; X. (1179^b 26), *ib.*
Rhet. I. (1. 11), 116*b*; (2. 13), 116*a*; II. (21. 6), 116*b*
- C.
- C. I. L. (xi. 3593), 276*a*, *b*
- Caesar:—
de Bell. Gall. (II. 35. 1; III. 10), 173*a*
- Callimachus:—
Altra (New Fragment, in *Sitzungsberichte der kön. preuss. Akad. der Wissenschaft.*), 88*a*
- Calpurnius:—
Idyll V. (60 *sq.*), 268*a*
- Cicero:—
ad Att. X. (12. 2), 283*b*
Orator (214), 155*b*
Topica (55), 117*b*
- Ctesias:—
Περσικῶν (II. 5), 147*a*
- D.
- Demosthenes:—
Leptines (C. 7), 49*b* f.; (C. 139), 50*b*, 128*a*, *b*
Phormio, (§ 47), 268*a*; (§ 50), 267*b* f.
- Diodorus:—
XI. (14), 147*a*
- E.
- Euripides:—
Bacch. (659), 48*b*; (677 *sq.*), 47 f.
I.A. (7 *sq.*), 190 f.
Rhesus (287 *sqq.*), 87 f.
Troad. (508), 49*a*, *b*
- H.
- Herodotus:—
VII. (132), 145*b*; VIII. (35), 145*a*; (54), 146*a*
- Hesychius:—
(Nauck *Adesp.* 201), 87*a*
- Homer:—
Iliad I. (66), XXIII. (117), 36*b*
- Homeric Hymns:—
ad Apoll. (402), 221*a*
ad Herm. (41, 188, 346), 221*b* f.
ad Hest. XXIV. (4), XXIX. (8 *sqq.*), 222*b* f.
- Horace:—
Odes IV. (5. 34), 276*b*
- J.
- Justin:—
Epit. Trog. Pomp. (II. 12. 8), 147*a*, 148*a*
- L.
- Livy:—
XXI. (31 *sq.*), 124*b* ff.
- Lucan:—
Phars. III. (550 *sqq.*), 269*a*; V. (28 *sqq.*), 237*b*; (460 *sq.*), 238*b*
- Lucian:—
Hermotimus 71 (313), 202*a*
Philops. 32 (58), *ib.*
Timon 40 (153), *ib.*
- Lucretius:—
I. (453 *sq.*), 264 ff.
V. (77, 107), 242*a*

Lysias:—

Or. II (§§ 24-28), 14b f.; *Or.* VII. (§ 1, coll. 41, VI. 44, X. 26, XVI. 12, XXI. 18, Deinarchus *Or.* I. 93), 15; *Or.* XXX. (§ 6, coll. VI. 44, X. 21), 15

M.

Manilius:—

II. (507 sqq.), 242a

Marcus Aurelius:—

I. (5). 219a; III. (16 § 2), 219b; IV. (3 § 3), (33), 220b; V. (6 § 2, 12, 36), *ib.*; VI. (16 § 4), *ib.*; VII. (24), *ib.*; VIII. (31, 41), 221a; IX. (21, 30), *ib.*; XI. (11, 18, 20, 26, 34), 221b; XII. (2, 36), *ib.*

Meleager:—

Stephanus (31 sq.), 229b

N.

New Testament:—

I Cor. vi. (5), 191b f.
Gal. iii. (26-28), 191a
I John iii. (22), v. (14), 192b
St. James i. (17), iv. (2 sq.), 192b
St. John xiv. (13); xvi. (24, 26), 192b
St. Mark vi. (22, 25), 192a
St. Matthew vii. (7), 192b; xx. (20-22), 192a

O.

Orientius:—

Commonitorium I. (35 sqq., 145 sqq.), II. (181 sq.), 41; II. (190 coll. 58), 42a, b

Orosius V. (16), 126b

P.

Pausanias:—

X. (8. 7), 147b; (14. 5), *ib.*; (19. 1), 148a

Phaedrus:—

V. (vi. 6), 263a

Philostratus:—

Vitae Sophistarum II. (v.), 225 f.

Pindar:—

Nem. III. (3), 86 f., 156 f.

Plato:—

Alcib. I. (103A-B), 188b
Apol. (24B, 40A-B), 188a; (27B-E), 188b
Crito (46B), 6a
Euthyd. (272E), 188b
Euthyphro (2E), 187a
Phaedo I. (72D), 85a, b; II. (74C), 85b f.; II. (105A), 228 f.
Polit. (310C), 2b

Plautus;

Mil. Gl. (552), 266a
Rud. (86 coll. 576 sqq., *Amphitruo* 1094 sqq., 1062, 1067), 40 f.; (1256), 263

Plutarch:—

de Pyth. Orac. C. 2 (395B), 3 (395F), 4 (396B), 7 (397B), 217; C. 7 (397C), (397D), 9 (398E), 10 (399A), 218a; C. 11 (399E), 12 (400A), 12 (400D), 16 (401F), 218b; C. 19 (403F), 20 (403F), 27 (407F), 219a; C. 29 (408F), 219b

Plutarch—continued.

Moralia (Bernadakis. ed. Teubn.):—(7E, 8B, 9A, 13B, 21B), 257a; (41A, 48B, 62D, 87D, 90C, 94E, 96D), 257b; (109D, 110A, 119E, 127C, 140B, 152D, 171E, 181C, 182C, *ib.* D), 258a; (185A, 190A and 221F, 191B and 211F, *ib.* D, 195A, 200A, *ib.* C, 206B, 208B, 210A), 258b; (210B, 213B, 215E, 219F, 220F, 222A, 224C, *ib.* F), 259a; (225B, 226E, *ib.* F, 227C, 228A, 229A), 259a; (230B, 231E, 232E, 234D), 259b; (237D, 238E, 263E, 272C, 285B, 290D), 260a; (294A, 295A, 306B, 307A, 308F, 316C, 317C, 324F), 260b; (326A, 327B, *ib.* D, 328B, *ib.* E, 334E, 336B, 347B), 261a; (347F, 349F, 351F, 355A), 261b; (355E, 360B, 361E, 362C, 364E, 366E), 262a; (377C, 380B, 381F, 383A), 262b

Numa (9), 147b

Solon (20-24), 38 ff.

Polybius:—

III. (47-50), 123 ff.

Propertius:—

I. iv. (16), vi. (17), viii. (46), xvi. (2), 7a; xvi. (47), xvii. (3), 7b
II. i. (37), 7b; iii. (27), vi. (5, 12), ix. (13, 15, 17), 8a; x. (23), xiii. (47), 8b; xv. (27 sq., 41), 9a; xvi. (32), xxiv. (13), xxv. (1 sq., 39), 9b; xxv. (45), xxviii. (6, 22), xxix. (3, 4, 5), 10a; xxix. (41), xxxii. (3 sqq.), 10b; xxxii. (15 sq., 61), xxxiv. (83, 93), 11a
III. vii. (45 sq.), viii. (13), 11b; ix. (23 sqq.), 12a, b; xi. (35 sqq.), 79a, (55), 79b; xiii. (5 sqq.), 79b; xiv. (33), xv. (31), xviii. (1-8), 80a; xviii. (9 sq.), xxii. (25), 80b
IV. i. (36, 47), 80b, (65, 71, 81, 124), 81a; ii. (5, 28, 34, 35, 44), 81b; iv. (39, 73 sq., 75, 83), 81b f.; v. (28 sq., 63), 82a, b; vii. (57), 81b

R.

Rhetorica ad Alexandrum (c. 10), 117b

S.

St. Thomas Aquinas:—

(*Ad Anal. Post.* Ed. Vatic. I., p. 141), 118a

Sappho:—

(*Oxyrhynch. Pap.* 1231 fr. 1), 73 ff., 127a, b, 189 f.; (*fr.* 75), 75b, 127b; (*Pap.* 1232), 75b

Silius Italicus:—

Pun. VIII. (483 sqq.), 274b

Sophocles:—

Ichneut. (300), 224b
O.T. (980-2), 230a, b
Philoct. (493), 227b

Statius:—

Achill. I. (443 sqq.), 269b
Silvae I. vi. (75-80), 158b f.

T.

Tacitus:—

Agric. (c. 12, 13, 14, 16, 17), 43a; (c. 21, 22, 23), 43b; (c. 23, 24, 25 sq.), 44a; (c. 29, 38), 44b

Theocritus:—

Epigram. xxiv. (5), 161a
Id. i. (106 sq.), 159a, b; vii. (78 sq.), 160a; xxv. (158), 161a; xxvi. (29), 160a f.; xxix. (3), 161a

Theon Smyrnaeus:—

de Astron. (16), 191*b*

Thucydides:—

I. (26), 149*a*

II. (48. 3), 84 f.; (72), 149*a*

Tibullus:—

I. ix. (11), 203*a*

V.

Valerius Flaccus:—

V. (565), 268*b*

Virgil:—

Aen. III. (257), 89*b* f.; VII. (116 coll. 176), *ib.*;
(748 *sq.*), 88

Culex (24-41), 119 ff.

Vitruvius:—

II. (1), 245*a*

X.

Xenophon:—

Memorabilia I. (i. 1), 185*b*; (i. 2), (i. 4), (iii. 4),
(iv. 2), 186*a*; IV. (iii. 14), 186*b*; (viii. 1, 5, 6),
187*a*

III.—INDEX VERBORUM.

A.—GREEK.

- A.
 ἄγρεμεν (?), 78*b*
 Ἀθηναῖον, 268*a*
 ἀθρήματα (Hesych.), 75*a*
 αἰτεῖν, αἰτεῖσθαι (N.T.), 192 f.
 Αἰτναῖος κάνθαρος, 223 f.
 ἀκρίζειν, 47 f.
 ἀνάμνησις, 86*a*
 ἀναπηρώσας (?), 222*a*
 ἀνθρακες ὁ θησαυρός, 263*a*
 ἄνωνις—ὄνωνις, 229*a*, *b*
 ἄξονες, 39*a*
 ἀπόδειξις, ἀποδείκνυμι, 148*b* ff.
 ἀπολογισμός, 150*b* (n.)
 ἄρκον=ἄρκτον (?), 161*a*
 ἄσσων, 'throbbing,' 191*b*
 Ἀσώπιον ὕδωρ, 86 f., 156 f.
 αὐξάνιος, 197*b* f.
 αὐτόρριζος ἐστία, 87*a*, *b*
- Δ.
 δαιμόνιον, 185 ff.
 διάνοιχα, 17*b*
- E.
 ἐνθύμημα, 117*b* f.
 ἐνι, ἐνεστι (N.T.), 191 f.
 ἐπαγωγή, 33 f.
 ἐπιπειθές, 4*a*
- Z.
 ζημία, 'detriment,' 'mischief,' 142*b*
- H.
 Ησσε, 157*b* f.
- Θ.
 Θεὸς Σολμος (inscr.), 166*b*
- K.
 καὶ μὴν, 128*a*, *b*
 κάνθων, 224*a*
 καταγίξειν, 61*b*
 κέχυμαι, 86*b*, 157*b* (n.)
 κρήδεμνον, 49*a*, *b*
- Λ.
 λέγειν, epitactic force of, 6*a*
 λέπας, 48*a*
 λόγος (Aristotle), 2 ff., 6 f.
- M.
 μάστερ (inscr.), 166*b*
- N.
 Νεοπτόλεμος, 266*b*
 νοῦς, νοεῖν (Aristotle), 35*b*
 νύξ μυστική, 37*b*
- O.
 ὄργια, 'resurrection rites,' 61*b*
 ὀρθὸς λόγος, ὁ, 2*b* f., 6 f.
- Π.
 παρακούειν, 3*a*
 παράταξις, 220*a*
 παρέλκειν, 250
 παρορᾶν, 3*a*
 πάσχειν, 85*a*
 πένθεα, 'rites of mourning,' 61*b*
 πεσδομάχεντας (?), 74*a*, 127*b*
 πόλεμος, 266 f.
 πόλις, 266*b*
 πολίτευμα (inscr.), 197*a*
 προτέλεια, 37*b*
- P.
 ῥοδόμαλον, 161*b*
- Σ.
 σείριος, 191*b*
 σκήπτος, 'tornado,' 98*b*
 σῶς (σῶος) μένειν, 48*b*
- T.
 τεκμήριον (Aristotle), 115, 117*a*, *b*
 τελείος, 'grown up,' 36*b*
 τελετή, 36 ff.
 τιῶ=τίνι (?), 78*b*
 τραυματίας, 9*a*
 Τριπτόλεμος, 266*b*
- Τ
 ὕδωρ καὶ γαῖα γένοισθε, 263*b*
- Φ.
 φαναι, 3*a*
 φθαρτά, τὰ, 34*a*
 φλεγμόνη, 218*a*
 φρόνησις=λόγος τῆς ἀρετῆς, 7*a*
 φύσις(τέχνη, 101*a*, *b*

B.—LATIN.

A.

absorpsi (Lucan), 235*b*
aedilis Etruriae, 275*a*
sacris Volcani faciundis (inscr.), 25*b*
akalanthis, 55*a*
alludere, 90*a*
aquā (genitive, never dative), 264
Arabs (? neuter), 80*a*
ars, 'method' or 'a treatise', 142*a*
artaba, 199*b*
auditus, 'heard of' (Lucan), 236
auxilia, 226 f.

C.

cacumina, 'tree-tops', 268*b*
carbonem pro thesauro, 263*a*
centuriatio, 108*b*

D.

demensum, *demensus cibus*, 89*b*
Domus Divina (inscr.), 43*a*

E.

exaudi = 'O hear my prayer', 9*b*

F.

fastibus = *fastis* (Lucan), 235*b*
'fallitur Iuppiter', 81*a*
Fortuna, 242*a, b*

G.

genius, 241*b* f.
gurgēs, 29*a*

H.

haustus, 'handful', 103*a*
hiemum (gen. plur.), not in extant literature, 102*a*

I.

iaculatus, passive (Lucan), 235*b*

M.

? O.L. *mesa* = *libum*, 89*b*
mensa, 'ration, portion', 89*b*
missilia, 42*b*

O.

opposito, 'pledged', 7*a*

P.

paniceae mensae, 89*b*
passer (Catullus), 54*b*
perfricata fronte, 'bluffing', 254*a*
philippeo (Propert.), 79*a*
pontifex Volcani, 25*b*
potens with abl., 11*b*
praeterea (Lucretius' use of), 103*b*
praetor Etruriae, 275*a*
sacris Volcani faciundis (inscr.), 25*b*
pretium facere alicui, 81*a*
princeps peregrinorum (inscr.), 171*a*
principes populorum (Livy ix. 36), 275*a*
probatoria, 251*a*
pronus, 41*b*

Q.

quinquennales, 108*a, b*

R.

regulus, 55*a*
Roma Quadrata, 245*b*

S.

sanct s, 'inviolable', 120*a*
satura, 208*b*
sensus, 'thought' (Cic.), 102*a*
serui (?), 268*a*
Sidicina (?), 10*b*
simul (Low Lat. use of), 8*a*

V.

vacare, erotic use of, 10*a*
venerandus, 120*a*

RECEIVED
JAN 10 1900

PA
1
C7
V.28

The classical review

PLEASE DO NOT REMOVE
CARDS OR SLIPS FROM THIS POCKET

UNIVERSITY OF TORONTO LIBRARY
